	Case 1:13-cr-10048-FDS Document 243 Filed 01/07/16 Page 1 of 117	
	Case 1.13-ci-10040-i D3 Document 243 Thea 01/07/10 Page 1 of 117	1-1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
4		
5)	
6) No. 13-10048-FDS vs.	
7	KING BELIN,	
8	Defendant.)	
9		
10	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE F. DENNIS SAYLOR, IV	
11		
12	DAY 1 - JURY IMPANELMENT	
13		
14		
15	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse Courtroom No. 2	
16	1 Courthouse Way Boston, MA 02210	
17		
18	December 22, 2014 8:29 a.m.	
19	0.25 a.m.	
20		
21		
22	77-1 ' 7 0177	
23	Valerie A. O'Hara Official Court Reporter	
24	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Room 3204	
25	Boston, MA 02210 E-mail: vaohara@gmail.com	

1	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>	
2	THE CLERK: All rise. Thank you. You may be seated.	
3	Court is now in session in the matter of United States vs.	
4	King Belin, Criminal Matter Number 13-10048.	
5	Counsel, please identify yourself for the record.	
6	MR. GARRITY: Good afternoon, your Honor, Paul Garrity	
7	for King Belin.	
8	THE COURT: Good morning. Mr. Wortmann is not here.	
9	Is the defendant here?	
10	THE MARSHAL: I'm sorry.	
11	THE COURT: Is the defendant here?	
12	THE MARSHAL: Yes.	
13	THE COURT: Why don't we bring him in. Lisa, why	
14	don't you see if you can find Mr. Wortmann.	
15	THE MARSHAL: I'm just waiting on a second person.	
16	THE CLERK: Mr. Wortmann, can you identify yourself	
17	for the record.	
18	MR. WORTMANN: Yes, forgive me, your Honor,	
19	John Wortmann for the United States.	
20	THE COURT: Good morning. All right. We'll bring the	
21	defendant out in a moment. We'll wait for him before we take	
22	anything up.	
23	MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, do you need a copy of the	
24	witness list?	
25	THE COURT: I quess I'll double check against the one	

1 I have. I have four witnesses from the defense. Are they all from Boston? 2. 3 MR. GARRITY: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: While we're waiting, I did receive 4 5 Mr. Garrity's message about Florida v. Nixon, which I've looked 6 at, and I want to give you a chance to talk about that. MR. GARRITY: Thank you. 7 THE COURT: And talk about whether there's anything 8 9 else we need to take up before the jury comes up. 10 MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, forgive me for asking a 11 question that I already asked and you already answered, but Number 1 is the front row? 12 13 THE COURT: Yes. There's something screwed up about 14 the seating here. We have a chair missing. 15 MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, if I could? 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 MR. GARRITY: I provided a tie for Mr. Belin. think he knows how to do the tie. Can I have a moment before 18 19 the jury comes in to put the tie on? 20 THE COURT: Yes. I'm questioning why there isn't a 21 second person. 22 MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, just for the record, I've 23 included the 12 witnesses out of an abundance of caution. I 24 don't believe I'll be calling all of them.

THE COURT: I expected as much. It matched what I

1 have. What I tell the jurors is that counsel is giving me a list of people who are potential witnesses or whose names may 2. 3 come up at the trial. 4 MR. WORTMANN: Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Sometimes that list is 100 people long, you know, six wind up being called. You know, it's just the 7 way it is. THE COURT: What is going on? 8 9 THE MARSHAL: I have no idea. My first call was 9:00, 10 I just called again. 11 THE COURT: All right. The defendant is present. 12 It's now 9:18. I am going to ask the marshal service, I want 13 the defendant here on time every day, all right. I don't want 14 to waste 20 minutes of my time and the attorneys' time or, you 15 know, once the trial starts, the jury's time. I understand 16 sometimes things go wrong, but I want the defendant here on time. 17 18 THE MARSHAL: Understood, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: With that, let's begin. As I indicated, I 20 did receive Mr. Garrity's e-mail concerning Florida v. Nixon, 21 which I have read. 2.2 Mr. Garrity, do you want to be heard on that? 23 MR. GARRITY: Yes, your Honor. This case was pointed 24 out to me by a colleague. I was not aware of this when we

addressed this issue last week or the week before, and although

it's not on all fours, I think one critical paragraph is the paragraph beginning with Section 2 of the Court's opinion.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.

MR. GARRITY: Which outlines what a defense attorney's obligations are in contrast to a client's wishes. I believe that paragraph outlines and supports the proposition I put forward before that the defense attorney has strategic control, has to consult with the client, but the defense attorney to fulfill its obligations has control to put forward what he thinks is the best strategy even if it conflicts with a client's wishes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GARRITY: I think that fulfills the client's Sixth Amendment right to counsel, Sixth Amendment right to put forward a defense, a Sixth Amendment right to compulsory process and a Sixth Amendment right to consult and cross-examine.

THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann, do you want to respond?

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, again, I'm somewhat in the dark because I don't have the factual basis for it, but I think the Supreme Court made clear distinctions between sort of ordinary tactical decisions, important decisions, including questions of overarching defense strategy and then recognizing that the defendant has ultimate authority. As to the overarching, it said they have to consult on issues of whether

1.5

to plead guilty, waive a jury, testify on his own behalf or take an appeal that the defendant really does have the exclusive authority, and, of course, this case dealt with a situation where the defendant took no position one way or the other on the question of whether or not the lawyer was going to effectively admit guilt in a guilt phase in anticipation of the penalty phase, so I just don't know how it cuts, but I guess what troubles me here is, first, as the one thing I'm aware of, the issue of whether or not there's a defense of a plant of a gun, we know there's no evidence to support it because

Mr. Belin said it didn't happen.

And the other thing is if there's -- if the issue is you have a -- if the defendant doesn't have the ultimate authority over tactical decisions, then why haven't we filed a stipulation when everybody but the defendant agrees that it's in his best interest?

THE COURT: All right. Let me, I guess, cut to the quick here. I did read *Florida v. Nixon*. The question there is the obligation of the attorney to consult with the client and obtain his consent before making certain decisions, and the Supreme Court made clear that consultation and consent are different things.

The defendant has ultimate authority as to whether to plead guilty, waive a jury, testify or take an appeal, and the attorney must both consult with the client and obtain the

2.

client's consent, and the attorney does not require the client's consent to every tactical decision.

In that case, the strategy was explained and the client was silent. It seems to me this is perhaps an inverse situation, what happens when an attorney consults with the client, as he's obligated to do, and the client says I don't want to do that, I don't want to follow your strategy or tactical decision, what right or authority does the client have to make at least relatively large scale strategic decisions?

I don't see how the client's wishes can be overridden after consultation and an informed waiver. It seems to me that has to be wrong. The client is the one on trial. It's not the attorney's right or the attorney's prerogative that's at issue, it's the client's.

The client plainly has a right to be consulted about a decision such as this, but what does consultation mean if it does not involve the right to weigh in and affect the decision or to make that decision if that decision is informed and intelligent.

Again, the client can waive trial altogether and plead guilty as long as he receives appropriate legal advice and makes a knowing and voluntary waiver. It would be bizarre if the client could waive that fundamental right but not a defense strategy, particularly one that may have no basis on the evidence.

2.

And I think it's also important to note that this is a factual issue or a set of factual issues, it's not something where legal training or expertise necessarily comes to bear directly on the question, such as a lawyer's decision how to frame a question or whether something is admissible under the rules of evidence.

So I don't see that it changes the decisions, and to the extent that the defendant is renewing his obligation or motion to withdraw, it's overruled.

The second topic I want to take up is Old Chief, which I reread over the weekend. The language of the Court and the tenor of Justice Souter's opinion goes I guess farther than I remembered, and it has led me to question Mr. Wortmann whether or not it would be more prudent to redact the offense of conviction from the conviction papers here.

It's not clear to me whether that's right or wrong or required by law. No one has directed a case to my attention directly on point, but certainly there is a lot of language in the appeal about to the effect that it doesn't matter what the offense of conviction is, it's just the fact of conviction.

This isn't a circumstance where the jury needs to hear the whole story to understand what's going on, all the government needs to do is prove the fact of conviction.

What is the government's reaction to that?

MR. WORTMANN: You know, your Honor, there are a

2.

couple of cases that I also cited in the opposition to the motion which talks about when there's significant gaps in the evidence like, for example, if there's bifurcation, that that can really lead to jury confusion and the jury not having any idea.

I mean, the whole point of the opinion in *Old Chief* was, you know, there are all these issues, and that's why we're going to take the stipulation, and we can, you know.

THE COURT: I clearly understand that piece of it, I'm just talking about the language and tenor of the opinion.

MR. WORTMANN: All of those things are what justifies the rule of law, which says "Thou shall stipulate if the defendant says," but why should he have both ends of the bargain?

I mean, it creates awkwardness, it creates potential for error if something slips out, and all he has to do is execute the stipulation. As I've said four or five times in this case, I'm happy to do it, but if he's going to say no, then the jury is entitled to hear the story, not necessarily until the facts, but at least to know what the conviction is and know that that conviction is a felony, otherwise, you know, you're asking them to make assessments based on without the evidence needed to do it.

THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.

MR. GARRITY: Well, your Honor, I think Old Chief does

speak in a particular sentence. I think I argued to the Court before about the extremely prejudicial nature of introducing a similar type of offense, and here this is almost on all fours. It's possession of a firearm unlawfully and possession of ammunition. That would, I submit, be extremely prejudicial.

I know the government has the right to prove their case, has the right to present a felony, but they have other avenues other than presenting this particular conviction to the jury.

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, it's unfair for the defendant to be able to tell the government how to do their case. I think it's also important to think of sort of the historical development that led up to *Old Chief* because if you look at the older decisions, there would be five or six or seven or eight, and there was an unfairness in that, and the Supreme Court said let's level the playing field, but the way you level the playing field is by saying to the defendant the ball is in your court, you can rid yourself of this.

He shouldn't have the right to say, you know, go prove your case, but keep your hands behind your back.

THE COURT: All right. Let me do this. Let me go back and look at the cases you cited, which I didn't -- well, I didn't think to read it over the weekend, let's put it that way. We have a couple weeks before the trial starts, if I do plan to revisit this issue, I would let counsel know. If I go

down this path, it would be the bare minimum redaction necessary to eliminate the nature of the prior offense, but I also need to look at your exhibits as well and see if this makes sense.

MR. WORTMANN: You do have a copy.

THE COURT: Yes, I do.

2.

All right. It's 9:30 or so now. I think the jury will be up in about 15 minutes. Is there anything anyone else wants to take up while I have you here? We have 52 people apparently downstairs. They brought in too many. I told them 42. We'll have 10 in reserve in case we need them.

Mr. Garrity.

MR. GARRITY: Judge, just to make sure I covered everything with respect to the counsel issue, I understand the Court's ruling but object again on Sixth Amendment right to counsel, Sixth Amendment right to present all proofs favorable to defense, Sixth Amendment right to compulsory process, Sixth Amendment right to confront cross-examiner and Fifth Amendment right due process and a fair trial.

I understand what Mr. Belin wishes to see happen, but I'm just telling the Court that it's my strategic review of the evidence that his only defense is the one I wish to put forward. I think to prohibit me violates those rights that I just listed.

THE COURT: Again, just to be clear, I'm not

```
1
      prohibiting anything, but the objection is overruled. Anything
      else?
 2.
 3
               MR. WORTMANN: I don't believe so, thank you, your
 4
      Honor.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
 6
               MR. GARRITY: No, your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Belin is in street
 7
      clothes. I'm sorry, Mr. Belin, I'm embarrassed to ask you
 8
 9
      this. Am I pronouncing your name correctly, is it Belin?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it's Belin.
11
               THE COURT: Your name was pronounced different ways,
12
      and I had suddenly blanked on whether I was pronouncing it
13
      correctly.
14
               Why don't we take a recess. Again, I expect we'll
15
      have about 42 people in here, and we'll start the impanelment
16
      process.
17
               THE CLERK: All rise.
18
               (A recess was taken.)
19
               THE CLERK: All rise. Court is now in session in the
20
      matter of the United States vs. King Belin, Criminal Matter
21
      Number 13-10048, the Honorable Dennis Saylor now presiding.
22
      You may be seated.
23
               THE COURT: Will counsel please identify themselves
      for the record.
24
```

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, good morning, John Wortmann

for the United States.

2.

1.5

MR. GARRITY: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Paul Garrity. I represent King Belin, and he's right here. Good morning.

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dennis Saylor. I'm the Judge assigned to preside over this session of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. It's a pleasure to welcome you on behalf of the Court as potential members of the jury.

I understand that you've seen a video this morning that explains something of the process that we're going to go through in selecting a jury and what's expected of you if you're selected to serve. I'm going to add some words of explanation of my own, and I apologize if I repeat some things that may have been on the video or that you may already know.

Let me start off by telling you what kind of a case this is because many of you may be curious about that. This is a criminal case. There's one defendant, King Belin, who's here in the courtroom with his counsel. He's charged with illegal possession of a firearm and ammunition. Those of you who are chosen as jurors will be told later what the exact charge is and what the government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt in order for you to convict the defendant.

Now, I think you've been told this, but I'll assure you anyway, we are impaneling today for a case that's going to

start on January 5th. The trial is not going to occur this week or next. That's highly unusual. We're doing it for two reasons. We don't want to try the case this week or next obviously because of the Christmas and New Years holiday, and we don't want to pick the jury on January 5th because that's the same day that jury selection will begin in United States vs. Tsarnaev, which is the marathon bombing case, and we're going to bring in more than a 1,000 potential jurors that morning, and I didn't want to have you tangled up in that case because everything would have been much more difficult to do.

So we're doing this unusual thing where we're going to impanel the jury today, and we're not going to start for two weeks until January 5th. We're doing that to make this process easier for all of us and all of you, and I appreciate your patience in understanding doing that.

The lawyers expect that this case will probably take three days to try. It may be less, conceivably it could be more. I'm going to do my best to hold them to that. Sometimes things wind up being a little different than we expect, but I expect that the jury will begin hearing the evidence on Monday, January 5th, and that they'll begin deliberating by about Wednesday, January 7th.

Our trial will be from nine in the morning to one in the morning with two very short breaks, and I'll explain to those of you who are picked why we do that and what we expect

from you.

2.

1.5

Now, you've already heard probably quite a bit about the importance of jury service, but I want to add a few thoughts of my own. Our jury system goes back at least 800 years to the time of England in the Middle Ages. Although much has changed since then, the idea is essentially the same. No person can be convicted of a serious crime except upon the unanimous vote of a jury made up of ordinary citizens.

The founders of our nation believed that the right to a jury was so important that they put it in the United States Constitution in the Bill of Rights. Juries have always been composed of ordinary citizens taken from all walks of life, each of whom brings their own individual experience and life experience to the table.

You don't have to have any particular education. What is truly important is that you take your responsibilities seriously and that you exercise your authority to the best of your ability. The quality of justice in the United States depends on the good judgment and common sense of ordinary citizens. It is a great system. It is not a perfect system. Nothing created by human beings will ever be perfect, but it is a great system, nonetheless.

A trial by jury is not necessarily the most efficient way to decide whether someone should be convicted of a crime, and there are things about it that are old fashioned, but there

are things that are more important than efficiency, and protection of our rights is one of those things.

1.5

We all enjoy a great many rights and freedoms in this country. Probably all of us take them for granted from time to time. Sometimes we have to be reminded of what those rights are and why they're important. The jury is one of the most basic protectors of our freedom. It's fundamental to our system of justice, and it's both an obligation of citizenship and an honor and a privilege to serve.

If you are selected to serve, I hope that you will exercise your duties solemnly and responsibly and in accordance with the law, but you should not assume that your service will be burdensome. Many jurors find that it is one of the most interesting and rewarding experiencing of their lives.

All right. Let me talk next about how we're going to select a jury. The parties in this case have a right to a jury that is fair and impartial, one that is not biased or prejudiced one way or the other. In order to try to obtain a fair jury, we have a selection process that we go through. The process begins with me introducing the case, introducing the lawyers and the defendant. That's to see if you know about them or have a connection with them.

I'll list the potential witnesses, again, to see if any of you know them, and then I'll ask some other questions on other topics. The purposes of those questions is to determine

2.

whether or not any of you should be excused for what we call cause. Once we've gone through that whole process and have eliminated people who cannot or should not serve on the jury for one reason or another, we'll call a group of people up into the jury box.

By law, the lawyers will have an opportunity to challenge a small number of those prospective jurors. Those are what we call peremptory challenges. That's where the lawyers don't have to give a reason, and when the lawyers are both satisfied with the jury or they've run out of challenges, the people who are left will be the jury.

Even though the trial is short, we're going to impanel 14 jurors, 2 will serve as alternates. That way if something happens to one or two of the jurors, we won't have to start the trial all over again. Only 12 jurors will deliberate and vote, and that means if we have not lost anyone, we'll have to take two of you off the jury. The extra two jurors will not be taken off until the end of the trial when the time has come to deliberate.

If you're not chosen to sit on this jury, you should not think that it reflects upon you personally or your ability to be a good juror or a good citizen. This is not a scientific process, it's not a merit selection process, and you should not be at all concerned if for some reason you're not chosen.

All right. Now, I'm going to start by asking you some

2.

questions. Your answers must be under oath. In other words, you must swear that your answers are true. It's very important that you give truthful answers, so I will ask the deputy clerk to please swear in the jury pool.

THE CLERK: Will you all please stand and raise your right hand.

(Prospective Jurors were sworn.)

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

THE COURT: All right. When I ask a question, if your answer is yes or you think your answer might be yes, please raise your hand so I can see you. If you raise your hand, I'm going to ask you to come over here to the sidebar where I'm going to follow up with you one-by-one. The lawyers will be here and each individual member of the jury panel one-by-one.

I'll try to find out what the issue is, maybe explore it a little bit with you. I might excuse you or I might not. For some of my questions, more than one of you are going to raise your hand. When that happens, I'd like you to line up here to the entrance to the enclosure, and I'll take you one at a time.

Please do not be shy. Don't hesitate to raise your hand if you're not sure what to do. The time to ask questions or to raise issues is now, not partway through the trial, and I will not be upset with you if you raise your hand because you aren't sure or weren't sure what to do.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Again, the case on which you've been called to sit is a criminal case. There is one defendant, King Belin. Again, he is charged with possession of a firearm and ammunition and doing so illegally, possessing a firearm and ammunition after a previous conviction for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of more than one year. I would ask counsel now to reintroduce themselves, Mr. Wortmann. MR. WORTMANN: Thank you, your Honor. Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. My name is John Wortmann. I'm an Assistant United States Attorney, and I practice here in Boston. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Garrity. MR. GARRITY: Good morning, again. My name is Paul Garrity. Again, I represent King Belin, who's hopefully going to stand up and look around. (Defendant standing) THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Again,

John Wortmann is the Assistant United States Attorney, the prosecutor in this case, he represents the government.

Paul Garrity is the defense attorney. He represents Mr. Belin.

Do any of you know or are any of you related to or acquainted with Mr. Belin? I see no hands.

To your knowledge, does any member of your family or any close friend know Mr. Belin? I see no hands.

1 Do any of you know or are you related to or are acquainted with any of the lawyers in this case? I see no 2 hands. 3 To your knowledge, does any member of your family or 4 5 any close friend know any of the lawyers in this case? I see no hands. Have you or any member of your family or any of your close friends ever worked for the United States Attorney Office 8 or had any dealings with them? I see a hand. All right. I'll 9 10 see you at sidebar. 11 (THE FOLLOWING OCCURRED AT SIDEBAR:) 12 THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to stand at sidebar 13 like this so I can hear you, the lawyers can hear you and the 14 stenographer can hear you, and the first thing I'm going to ask 1.5 is your name and if you know your jury number. 16 THE JUROR: Amy Spurling. 29 maybe. 17 THE COURT: Yes. Why did you raise your hand? 18 THE JUROR: My friend works for the United States 19 District Court. She's one of the attorneys. 20 THE COURT: What's her name? 21 THE JUROR: Amanda Strachan. 22 THE COURT: Is she in the U.S. Attorney's Office? 23 MR. WORTMANN: I believe she is. 24 THE COURT: And she's a friend of yours?

THE JUROR: Yes.

```
THE COURT: Is she a close friend?
 1
               THE JUROR: I went to law school with her, and we see
 2
      each other socially frequently.
 3
               THE COURT: And would that affect your ability to be a
 4
 5
      fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case?
               THE JUROR: I don't think so.
               THE COURT: I would need you to be completely
 7
      confident about that.
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: I am.
10
               THE COURT: And are you confident that you could
11
      decide the case on the evidence and be fair to both sides?
12
               THE JUROR: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Defense as well as the government?
14
               THE JUROR: Yes.
15
               THE COURT: What kind of a lawyer is, I'm sorry, your
      spouse?
16
17
               THE JUROR: She's a corporate and real estate.
18
               THE COURT: Where does she work?
19
               THE JUROR: The Drew Company up the street.
20
               THE COURT: Any follow-up from counsel?
21
               MR. GARRITY: Could I have one second, your Honor?
22
               THE COURT: Yes.
23
               MR. GARRITY: No, your Honor, thank you.
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
24
25
               THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Have you or any
```

2.

1.5

member of your family or any of your close friends ever worked for Mr. Garrity or had any dealings with him? I see no hands.

All right. I'm going to read a list of people who may be called as witnesses in this case. Not all of these people I expect will actually be called, but I've asked the lawyers to give me a list of all the potential witnesses or people whose names may come up in the trial, and please listen carefully because I'm going to ask you whether you know any of these people.

The first is a list of Boston police officers. All of these people work in some capacity or another with the Boston Police Department: Philip Bissonnette, David Bridges, Thomas Finn, Jeff Driscoll, Martin Velez, V-e-l-e-z, Kevin Magoon, M-a-g-o-o-n, Nina Jefferson, Tyrone Camper, Thomas Taylor, Maryellen Shea or Debra Dobrydney, D-o-b-r-y-d-n-e-y. Again, all of those are Boston police officers of one kind or another.

Brandon McClellan who's, a probation officer in Plymouth County; Mathieu Kelsch, K-e-l-s-c-h, who's with the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; Derek Kirkland of Boston; Damon Carpenter of Boston; Calvin White of Boston and Rafael Wallace of Boston.

Do any of you know or are you related to or acquainted with any of those people? All right. I see no hands.

To your knowledge, does any member of your family know

```
1
      or is any member of your family related to or acquainted with
      any of those people? I see no hands.
 2.
               Do any of you have any special disability or physical
 3
      problem that would make serving as a member of the jury
 4
      difficult or impossible or might interfere with your service as
      a juror? Okay. I'll see you.
               THE COURT: Hi. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: Donna Gradie.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Yes.
10
               THE JUROR: I went for a routine chest X-ray in
11
      November, and they found a nodule on my bottom right lung, went
12
      for a CAT scan. They found three more nodules. I have a
13
      appointment on Monday, the 29th. I don't know what's going to
14
      happen after that. So, you know, I'd rather be here at this
15
      rate, so I don't know what's going to happen.
16
               THE COURT: Can I do this, can I get you to step away
17
      and let me talk to the lawyers.
18
               What do you want me to do?
19
               MR. WORTMANN: I'm inclined to excuse her.
20
               THE COURT: Let her go?
21
               MR. GARRITY: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: Ms. Gradie.
23
               THE JUROR: I have a letter from my doctor, too.
24
      don't know if you need that.
```

THE COURT: I don't think you're lying to me.

```
1
      going to let you go. I think that's the safest thing to do.
               THE JUROR: It's Dr. Bordeaux at Beth Israel.
 2.
               THE COURT: I just hope you're all right. Have a good
 3
 4
      holiday.
 5
               THE JUROR: Thank you. Can I just go?
 6
               THE COURT: Yes, you can go. I'm sorry, I didn't
      realize there were other people. I'm sorry, come back.
 7
               THE JUROR: Bernard Hogarty.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Number 26, yes, sir.
10
               THE JUROR: I have difficulty hearing. People talk
11
      very softly. I have a tough time hearing.
12
               THE COURT: Were you having trouble hearing my
13
      instructions?
14
               THE JUROR: I had trouble hearing her. So, of course,
15
      if I'd be a little closer, it might make a difference, but I
16
      figured I'd let you in on that.
17
               THE COURT: That's fine.
18
               THE JUROR: I think my 30 years in a machine shop.
19
               THE COURT: We have, I think, headphones we can use
20
      for people who are hearing impaired. Would that work do you
21
      think?
22
               THE JUROR: Yes, that works.
23
               THE COURT: If you can't hear my questions or anything
24
      else that's going on, raise your hand.
```

THE JUROR: I can hear you very good. You speak with

```
1
      a little more volume.
               THE COURT: And if you wind up sitting on the jury and
 2.
      you have any problem at all, let us know right away, we'll deal
 3
      with it as best we can.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Any follow-up?
               MR. WORTMANN:
                             No, thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: Next. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: I'm not sure I should come up.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: That's all right. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: Jennifer Scalese.
10
11
               THE COURT: Number 32.
12
               THE JUROR: I was diagnosed with moderate anxiety, and
      the day the trial is happening, I think it would increase
13
14
      anxiety, as my hands are already sweating.
15
               THE COURT: All right. Can I get you to step away
16
      just for a minute?
17
               THE JUROR: Sure.
18
               THE COURT: Do you want me to pursue this, counsel, or
19
      let her go?
20
               MR. WORTMANN: I think you should let her go.
21
               THE COURT: Ms. Scalese. All right. I think the safe
22
      thing to do is to just let you go and have a good holiday.
23
               THE JUROR: Thank you.
24
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as I said, this case
25
      will begin on Monday, January 5th. Our trial day will be from
```

```
1
      9:00 to 1:00. I expect that the case will take about three
      days to try, it could be two or four but about four days. Once
 2.
      the jury begins to deliberate, if necessary, it will meet for
 3
      full days to 5:00, if necessary, until it reaches a verdict.
 4
 5
      Obviously, anyone who serves on the jury is going to be
 6
      inconvenienced to some extent, but do any of you have unusual
 7
      hardship caused by the daily schedule or the length of the
      trial? All right. I'll see you.
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: Hi, Bridget Garabedian.
10
               THE COURT: Hold on.
11
               MR. WORTMANN: 14, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: 14, thanks. Bridget Garabedian.
1.3
               THE JUROR:
                          No.
14
               MR. WORTMANN: I'm sorry.
1.5
               THE JUROR: I was the last person.
16
               THE COURT: Number 42. Yes, sir.
17
               THE JUROR: I run a small business that's generally
18
      I'm the only employee besides another person, so I work
19
      basically from 5:30 in the morning to 7:00 every day seven days
20
      a week.
21
               THE COURT: This is the Sunoco in Wayland?
22
               THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
23
               THE COURT: Where is that, Cochituate Road?
24
               THE JUROR: Route 20 and Cochituate, yes.
25
               THE COURT: Who's running the station now?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: My wife is currently there right now.
 2.
               THE COURT: All right. Here's what I'm inclined to
      do. You're last on the list, which makes it pretty unlikely
 3
      we'll get to you.
 4
 5
               THE JUROR:
                          Sure.
 6
               THE COURT: What I'm going to do is keep you for the
      time being, and if we get to that point, we'll revisit that
 7
      issue, so listen to the rest of my questions, and we'll see how
 8
      it goes. We only need 14 people, and you are Number 42, so we
 9
10
      may not get to you.
11
               Next. Hi, what's your name?
12
               THE JUROR: Stephanie Smykal.
13
               THE COURT: Number 36. Yes.
14
               THE JUROR: My biggest issue is childcare. My son's
15
      full time childcare provider on Tuesdays and Thursdays, I
16
      talked to his daycare today, and they said they're full for
17
      Tuesday and Thursdays, otherwise I would send him, but we don't
18
      have family within 100 miles or all my friends work full time.
19
               THE COURT: That's on Tuesday and Thursday?
20
               THE JUROR:
                          Yeah.
                                  I work Mondays and Wednesdays.
21
               THE COURT: So you have other care for him?
22
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
23
               THE COURT:
                           What's your care on Monday and Wednesday?
24
               THE JUROR:
                          He goes to a childcare facility.
25
               THE COURT:
                           To a childcare facility. Okay. Let me
```

talk to the lawyers for a second.

2.

1.5

With someone like this, I could either let her go, I could leave her on because she's Number 36 and wait and see.

Do counsel have a view? What do you want me to do or I could pursue it further?

MR. GARRITY: Wait and see, Judge, I think.

THE COURT: One thing that I do sometimes is I drop people to the end of the list, which, you know, means it would makes it very unlikely they're going to be called. Sometimes it's a borderline case. I think I'll leave her in place for the time being, but if we come up with these other people.

All right, Ms. Smykal. Here's what I'm going to do for the time being. You're Number 36, which is almost at the end of the list, so I'm going to leave you on for now just, you know, to revisit it if it looks like we may need you, I'll bring you back up here and we'll talk a little more. I might let you go.

THE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: It's unlikely you'll be called anyway, and I want to make sure we won't run out of people, so I'll keep you on for now and listen to the rest of my questions, and we'll see how it goes.

Next.

THE JUROR: Johannah Oh.

THE COURT: Number 24. Yes. What's your situation?

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE JUROR: Starting from January 6th, I'll be the host family for three foreign students for Andover Public I have to provide them with the transportation before school and after school. THE COURT: So how old are these people? THE JUROR: Seventh, eighth and nine grade. THE COURT: And they are coming from? THE JUROR: Korea. THE COURT: Are they going to school here? THE JUROR: Andover Public School. THE COURT: Andover Public School. They arrive on the 6th; is that right? THE JUROR: I have to pick them up the 6th at Andover High. They're staying for one month. THE COURT: And is there anybody who could cover for you for what looks like will probably be a day, I think probably, right, if you pick them up or maybe two days, your husband or someone else at the school? THE JUROR: Because they pay me to do it, so I signed a contract and everything. I didn't know the trial would be the 5th so I already signed a contract for them. THE COURT: I guess my question is a little different, and that's whether anybody could cover you. THE JUROR: I don't have anyone right now. I have my

own daughter who's in middle school because I was doing it at

1 the same time that I drop her off and pick her up. THE COURT: All right. Let me talk to the lawyers for 2. a moment if you would step away. Counsel, any follow-up? What 3 4 do you suggest I do? 5 MR. WORTMANN: I'd be inclined to hold her, again, 6 maybe drop her to the bottom, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Garrity. MR. GARRITY: I'm not disinclined to hold her, but it 8 9 appears that she's not going to resolve the issue. 10 THE COURT: Well, should I drop her to the bottom of 11 the list as opposed to letting her go? 12 MR. GARRITY: Sure, that would make sense. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Oh. What I'm going to do, I'm not 14 going to let you go, but I'm going to drop you to the bottom of 1.5 the list which makes it much less likely that you'll be picked, 16 and then I'll re-evaluate it at that point. I'll see how you 17 compare with other people's hardships if we get that far, so 18 there will be a good chance you won't be called. You'll have 19 to listen to the rest of my questions. We'll see how it goes. 20 Next. 21 THE JUROR: Good morning. 22 THE COURT: Hi. What's your name? 23 THE JUROR: Sara Taylor. THE COURT: Number 20. Why did you raise your hand? 24 THE JUROR: I am self-employed, and I am flying out of 25

```
1
      Boston on January 6th for a job at 8:30 a.m.
               THE COURT: Okay. Where are you going?
 2.
               THE JUROR: Florida.
 3
               THE COURT: For work?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: Yes.
               THE COURT: What's it for? You're a realtor; is that
      right?
 7
               THE JUROR: Yes. So, actually, one of my
 8
 9
      investigators is a professional race time, and they hired me to
10
      do logistics coordination for a race in Sebring, Florida, and
11
      they've hired me the 6th through the 11th.
12
               THE COURT: And is there anyone who could cover you if
13
      you were stuck in Boston?
14
               THE JUROR: I'm covering for the person that normally
15
      works for them, which I professionally work with them in real
16
      estate, but they like what I am doing for work, so I am their
17
      backup.
18
               THE COURT: Can I get you to step away?
19
               THE JUROR: Sure.
20
               THE COURT: Counsel.
21
               MR. WORTMANN: I'd let her go, your Honor.
22
               MR. GARRITY: I would, too.
23
               THE COURT: Ms. Taylor, I'm going to let you go, so
24
      thank you and have a good holiday.
25
               THE JUROR: Thank you, you, too.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Next. Hi, what's your name?
               THE JUROR: Barbara Todd.
 2
               THE COURT: You are Number 37. Why did you raise your
 3
      hand?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: My husband has cancer, he's got pancreatic
 6
      cancer, and in January, he's going to be starting radiation.
 7
               THE COURT: When does he start radiation?
               THE JUROR: January 3rd, and right now he's going to
 8
 9
      chemo.
10
               THE COURT: Who's taking care of him today?
11
               THE JUROR: He's home with his sister.
12
               THE COURT: And could his sister cover if you wound up
      on jury duty, could his sister?
13
14
               THE JUROR: She could, yes.
15
               THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to do with you.
      are Number 37, which is pretty far down the list.
16
               THE JUROR: Okay.
17
               THE COURT: So I think it's probably not likely you're
18
19
      going to be called. What I'm going to do if we get that far,
20
      I'll revisit the issue, maybe call you back and explore it a
21
      little bit more.
2.2
               THE JUROR: Okay.
23
               THE COURT: In the meantime, I'm going to leave you
24
           I think you're pretty far down the list, so I think you'll
25
      probably be all right. I'll ask you to take a seat and listen
```

```
1
      to the rest of my questions, and we'll take it from there.
 2.
      Okay.
 3
               Next.
 4
               THE JUROR: I'm Sara Levy.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. You're Number 2.
               THE JUROR: I don't know if this is considered a
      hardship, but I have an anxiety disorder, and I've had a
 7
      horrible divorce for the last two and a half years, finally got
 8
 9
      divorced, but it is still ongoing, and so even being in this
10
      room makes me very uneasy. My husband is very abusive and
11
      harassed me on a daily basis. I have two lawyers, and it's
12
      just ramping up a lot, you know, I get very panicked. I just
13
      got some new anti-anxiety medicine, but I haven't noticed
14
      anything from it yet.
15
               THE COURT: So you're taking medication for anxiety?
16
               THE JUROR: I'm starting new stuff tomorrow.
               THE COURT: All right. Let me talk to the lawyers for
17
18
      a moment.
19
               MR. WORTMANN:
                              I would let her go.
20
               MR. GARRITY: I would, too.
21
               THE COURT: Ms. Levy, I'm going to let you go. Okay.
22
               THE JUROR: Thank you and have a good holiday.
23
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
24
               THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm
25
      going to ask you a series of questions that ask whether you
```

have some connection to law enforcement officers or the law enforcement system. I expect that more than one of you are going to raise your hand, and if you do, what I'm going to ask as a follow-up the nature of whatever relationship you have and whether that relationship would interfere with your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case.

Again, what matters most is whether you can be fair to both sides. What I'm concerned about here is prejudice or bias. Sometimes people have strong feelings about law enforcement that might affect their ability to be fair to both sides.

An individual police officer might or might not tell the truth in a particular case. That's for the jury to decide, but some people might generally favor police officers. They might have trouble believing that a police officer might lie. Others might generally dislike police officers and have trouble believing a police officer is telling the truth.

In other words, that would affect their view of the evidence of listening carefully and evaluating the case on its own merits. It would be unfair or wrong if any of the jurors who decide this case were prejudiced either in favor of law enforcement or against law enforcement. This case might be decided according to the evidence and according to the law and not because the jurors are prejudiced one way or the other.

So with that as an introduction, let me ask the

```
1
      following questions: Have you or any member of your immediate
 2
      family or any close friends ever been employed by the Boston
 3
      Police Department?
 4
               All right. Let me see you.
 5
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
               THE COURT: Yes.
               THE JUROR: Good morning.
               THE COURT: What's your name?
 8
               THE JUROR: Matt Duggan.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Number 28. Yes, sir, why did you raise
11
      your hand?
12
               THE JUROR: I have some friends that are currently on
13
      the Boston Police Department, and I work with the MBTA Police
14
      in the revenue department, so I work with a lot of MBTA also.
1.5
               THE COURT: Okay. And are these close friends?
16
               THE JUROR: Yeah.
17
               THE COURT: All right. And is there anything about
18
      that friendship or those relationships that would make it or
19
      that would interfere or affect your ability to be a fair and
20
      impartial juror in the trial of this case?
21
               THE JUROR: I don't think so.
22
               THE COURT: I need to be completely confident that
23
      you'll be fair to both sides. You didn't raise your hand that
24
      you recognized any of those people, so I assume none of the
25
      witnesses are going to be your friends, right?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: No, I didn't know any of the names.
 2
               THE COURT: And, again, are you confident you can be
      fair to both sides, listen to the evidence and decide?
 3
               THE JUROR: To the best of my ability, absolutely.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: And decide it on the basis, again,
      according to the evidence and according to the law?
               THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
 7
               THE COURT: Any follow-up, Mr. Wortmann?
 8
 9
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you.
10
               MR. GARRITY: Can I have one second, your Honor?
11
               THE COURT: Yes.
12
               MR. GARRITY: No, thank you.
1.3
               THE COURT: You can be seated.
14
               Next. Hi, what's your name?
1.5
               THE JUROR: Karin Sullivan.
16
               THE COURT: Number 41. Why did you raise your hand?
               THE JUROR: My father-in-law was the superintendent of
17
      the Boston Police, but that was back in the '80s, my
18
19
      brother-in-law retired from the Boston Police.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. So is your father-in-law your
21
      husband's father?
22
               THE JUROR: My husband's father. He's deceased.
23
               THE COURT: And you had a brother-in-law?
24
               THE JUROR: Right, my husband's father and brother.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything about those
```

```
relationships that would affect your ability to be a fair and
 1
      impartial juror in the trial of this case?
 2
               THE JUROR: No.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. Are you confident you can be fair
 4
 5
      to both sides? Again, we expect Boston police officers as
      witnesses. Are you confident you can be fair to both sides?
               THE JUROR: Yes, yes. I don't see that brother-in-law
 7
      that often.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Any follow-up questions?
10
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
12
               MR. GARRITY: One second again, your Honor. I think
13
      we're all set, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Next.
1.5
               THE JUROR: Hi, I'm Bridget Garabedian.
16
               THE COURT: We have two Garabedians.
17
               THE CLERK: 14.
18
               THE COURT:
                          14.
19
               THE JUROR: My husband's cousin is a police officer in
20
      Boston.
21
               THE COURT: Are you close to him?
22
               THE JUROR: We've seen him a few times a year, yes.
23
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that connection or
24
      relationship that would interfere with your ability to be a
25
      fair juror?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: I think I could be impartial.
               THE COURT: I need you to be confident that you can be
 2
      fair to both sides.
 3
               THE JUROR: Yes, I could be.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Any follow-up questions?
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you, your Honor.
               MR. GARRITY: No, thanks.
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
               THE JUROR: Thank you.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Next.
11
               Hi, what's your name?
12
               THE JUROR: Brian Hogan.
1.3
               THE COURT: Number 22. Why did you raise your hand?
14
               THE JUROR: I have two very good friends that are
1.5
      currently Boston police officers, and I have one friend who is
16
      out on disability being shot on the job over 20 years ago.
17
               THE COURT: Is there anything about those
      relationships or connections that would make it difficult or
18
19
      interfere with your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in
      this case?
20
21
               THE JUROR: I don't think so.
22
               THE COURT: I need to be completely confident.
23
               THE JUROR: No.
24
               THE COURT: We're going to have Boston police officers
25
      testify in this case, I expect. The case is about firearms or
```

```
1
      a firearm, and we need to make sure everybody is fair to both
      sides. Are you confident you can do so?
 2.
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: Even though you have very good friends on
 4
 5
      the police force?
               THE JUROR: They're not involved in this from the
 7
      names you read.
               THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann.
 8
 9
               MR. WORTMANN: Nothing, thank you.
10
               MR. GARRITY: Just a few questions.
11
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
               MR. GARRITY: Do your friends talk about their work at
12
13
      all?
14
               THE JUROR: Not to me. I mean, it's just, I mean,
15
      they're just friends of mine that I've known for over 40 years.
16
      I don't see them regularly now.
17
               MR. GARRITY: Given your friendship with your two
18
      friends, would you tend to believe a police officer simply
19
      because he's an officer?
20
               THE JUROR: No.
21
               MR. WORTMANN: If I can have a follow-up, would you
22
      tend not to believe them simply because they're police
23
      officers?
               THE JUROR: No.
24
25
               THE COURT: I'm going to ask that question of the
```

```
1
      whole panel.
 2.
               MR. GARRITY: Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you.
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I asked whether any
      of you or any immediate family members or close friends were
      ever employed by the Boston Police Department. Let me expand
 7
            Have you or any member of your immediate family or any
 8
 9
      close friends ever been employed by the Federal Bureau of
10
      Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives or ATF or any federal
11
      law enforcement agency, state law enforcement agency, like the
12
      Massachusetts State Police or city police department? Might
13
      pick the Massachusetts slip or the city law department?
14
      All right. I'll see you one-by-one.
1.5
               THE JUROR: Again, Stephanie Smykal. My Brother works
      for the San Diego sheriff's department, but it shouldn't
16
17
      matter.
18
               THE COURT: What kind of work does he do?
19
               THE JUROR: He's director of dispatch.
20
               THE COURT: And, again, is there anything about that
21
      relationship or connection that would affect your ability to be
22
      a fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case?
23
               THE JUROR:
                          No.
24
               THE COURT: Are you confident of that?
25
               THE JUROR: Uh-hum.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: You have to answer yes.
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 2.
               THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann.
 3
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you, your Honor.
 4
 5
               MR. GARRITY: No, thank you, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Next. Hi, what's your name?
               THE JUROR: Maria Elena Wilson.
               THE COURT: Number 12. Why did you raise your hand?
 8
               THE JUROR: My brother-in-law is a lieutenant in the
 9
10
      Cambridge Police force.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. What kind of work does he do?
12
               THE JUROR: I can't exactly answer it.
13
               THE COURT: Because you're not sure?
14
               THE JUROR: I'm not sure.
15
               THE COURT: And brother-in-law meaning your husband's
16
      brother?
               THE JUROR: My husband's brother.
17
18
               THE COURT: Are you close to him?
19
               THE JUROR: Yes.
20
               THE COURT: That is, close to your brother-in-law.
21
      hope you're close to your husband.
22
               THE JUROR: Yes, absolutely.
23
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that relationship
24
      or connection that would affect your ability to be a fair and
25
      impartial juror in the trial of this case?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: Not with this relationship, no.
               THE COURT: Is there any other reason?
 2.
 3
               THE JUROR: I do have other acquaintances that are in
      law enforcement.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Why don't we deal with it now. Who else
 6
      do you know?
 7
               THE JUROR: My daughter's basketball coach is a state
      police prosecutor in Wrentham.
 8
 9
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
10
               THE JUROR: And then my neighbor, he's employed by the
11
      IRS, but I think it has something to do with the DEA, and is
12
      that the ATF?
13
               THE COURT: Okay. It sounds like you're not quite
14
      sure.
15
               THE JUROR: No, I don't know what he does, so I'm kind
      of glad that I don't, but I have been interviewed by government
16
17
      officials in relationship to his character.
18
               THE COURT: As part of a background check?
19
               THE JUROR: Correct.
20
               THE COURT: I've been through that several times.
21
      It's kind of unnerving to have the people walking around asking
22
      what they think of you, but, in any event, is there anything
23
      about those relationships or connections that would affect your
24
      ability to be a fair and impartial in the trial of this case?
25
               THE JUROR: No, but there is my husband was arrested a
```

```
1
      couple years ago.
               THE COURT: Okay.
 2.
               THE JUROR: In Franklin.
 3
               THE COURT: For?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: For assault and battery. The case was
      dismissed.
               THE COURT: Do you feel he was treated fairly by the
      law enforcement system?
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: No, I don't.
10
               THE COURT: Obviously, that case has nothing to do
11
      with this case.
12
               THE JUROR: Correct.
13
               THE COURT: But the question, again, is there anything
14
      about that experience that would affect your ability to be a
15
      fair and impartial juror in this case?
16
               THE JUROR: I don't think so. I think I'm more
17
      cautious and skeptical, to answer your question.
18
               THE COURT: But the bottom line question is can you be
19
      fair, in other words, decide this case not because of what
      happened to your husband in Franklin but because of what the
20
21
      witnesses say and the laws as I instruct you and the other
      evidence in the case?
22
23
               THE JUROR: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: You don't have to erase your life
25
      experience, I want to make that clear, you are who you are and
```

```
1
      you experienced what you experienced, and you can bring it to
      the table, but you have to decide this case on its own facts,
 2
      not because you're mad at the Franklin Police Department or
 3
      anything else. Do you understand that?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: Absolutely.
               THE COURT: You're confident with all of this you can
      be fair --
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: -- to both sides? Any follow-up?
10
               MR. WORTMANN: Do you think you would be more
11
      skeptical of a police officer witness than a citizen witness?
12
               THE JUROR: No.
13
               THE COURT: You'll treat everybody the same?
14
               THE JUROR: Uh-hum.
               THE COURT: You have to answer yes for the record.
15
16
               THE JUROR: Yes.
17
               MR. GARRITY: I have no questions, thank you.
18
               THE COURT: You can be seated.
19
               Next. Hi, what's your name?
20
               THE JUROR: Dana Raines.
21
               THE COURT: Number 13. Yes, sir. Why did you raise
22
      your hand?
23
               THE JUROR: School police.
24
               THE COURT: You are a school policeman?
25
               THE JUROR: Yes.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Where do you work?
               THE JUROR: West Roxbury High School.
 2
               THE COURT: How long have you been doing that?
 3
               THE JUROR: Eighteen years.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: You must work sometimes with the Boston
      PD?
 6
 7
               THE JUROR: Yes.
               THE COURT: Is there anything about your experience or
 8
 9
      your occupation or your connection with the Boston PD that
10
      would make it difficult for you to be a fair and impartial
11
      juror in the trial of this case?
12
               THE JUROR: No.
13
               THE COURT: You're confident you can be fair to both
14
      sides?
15
               THE JUROR: Yes.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann, any follow-up?
17
               THE JUROR: No, thank you, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
19
               MR. GARRITY: Do you commonly interact with the Boston
20
      Police Department?
21
               THE JUROR: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: Given your interaction with them, would
23
      you tend to believe a police officer?
24
               THE JUROR: Well, I'd go by the judgment.
25
               MR. GARRITY: Thank you.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
               Next. Hi. What's your name?
 2
               THE JUROR: Donald Kosterman. I'm sorry.
 3
               THE COURT: Number 1. Yes, sir. Why did you raise
 4
 5
      your hand?
               THE JUROR: My brother-in-law was a police officer in
 7
      Gardner.
               THE COURT: Okay. Is he retired?
 8
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 9
10
               THE COURT: And is that your wife's brother?
11
               THE JUROR: It's my sister's husband.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. And are you close to him, your
13
      brother-in-law?
14
               THE JUROR: Fairly.
15
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that relationship
16
      or connection that would interfere with your ability to be a
17
      fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case?
18
               THE JUROR: No.
19
               THE COURT: You're confident you can be fair to both
20
      sides?
               THE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT: Any follow-up, Mr. Wortmann?
22
23
               MR. WORTMANN: No.
24
               MR. GARRITY: No, thank you.
25
               THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
1
               Next. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: Danielle Williams.
 2.
               THE COURT: Number 3. Yes, why did you raise your
 3
      hand?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: A close family friend of my next door
 6
      neighbor is a detective for the City of Fall River.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. Is this someone that you personally
      are close to?
 8
               THE JUROR: Yes, I've been growing up my entire life,
 9
10
      so he was like primary like caretaker after school for most of
11
      my life.
12
               THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything in that
13
      relationship or connection that would interfere with your
14
      ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?
15
               THE JUROR: I can't say with complete confidence, you
16
      know what I mean, I tend to favor toward the police.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. I think I'm not going to try to
18
      talk you out of that. It seems to me probably this isn't the
19
      right case for you to sit on, so why don't I let you go and
20
      maybe we'll get you on some different kind of case. Have a
21
      good holiday.
22
               THE JUROR: Thank you.
23
               THE COURT: All right. Next.
               THE JUROR: Hi.
24
25
               THE COURT: What's your name?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: Linda Araujo.
               THE COURT: 16. There you are.
 2
 3
               THE JUROR: My late husband was a police officer.
               THE COURT: Whereabouts?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR:
                           Westport, Mass.
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. How long ago did he pass away?
               THE JUROR:
                           Thirteen years.
               THE COURT: And how long was he on the force?
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: I think it was over 20 years.
10
               THE COURT: Okay. Was he a patrolman?
11
               THE JUROR: Yes.
12
               THE COURT: That was Westport?
13
               THE JUROR: Uh-hum.
14
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that fact or that
15
      connection that would make it difficult for you to be a fair
      and impartial juror in the trial of this case or that might
16
17
      interfere with your ability to be fair?
18
               THE JUROR: No.
19
               THE COURT: You're confident you can be fair to both
20
      sides?
               THE JUROR: Yes.
21
22
               THE COURT: Any follow-up?
23
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you, your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
25
               MR. GARRITY: No, thank you, your Honor.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Next. Hi. What's your
 2
      name?
 3
               THE JUROR: Carol Garneau.
               THE COURT: Number 23. Okay. Why did you raise your
 4
      hand?
 5
               THE JUROR: My brother-in-law is a retired police
 7
      officer.
 8
               THE COURT: Where did he retire from?
               THE JUROR: What city, I believe Hyde Park. I think
 9
      that's where he is.
10
11
               THE COURT: Hyde Park meaning --
12
               THE JUROR: -- part of Boston.
13
               THE COURT: So he was in the Boston PD?
14
               THE JUROR: (Nodding)
15
               THE COURT: Yes?
16
               THE JUROR: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: Sorry, she was taking it down, we can't
      get nods. Your brother-in-law, so is that your sister's
18
19
      husband?
20
               THE JUROR: My husband's brother.
21
               THE COURT: When did he retire, ballpark?
22
               THE JUROR: Eight years ago, ten years ago.
23
               THE COURT: Are you close to him?
24
               THE JUROR: Not really.
25
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that connection or
```

```
1
      relationship that would affect your ability to be a fair and
      impartial juror in the trial of this case?
 2
               THE JUROR: No.
 3
               THE COURT: Are you confident you can be fair to both
 4
 5
      sides?
               THE JUROR: Uh-hum.
               THE COURT: You have to answer yes.
 7
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann.
10
               MR. WORTMANN: No questions, thank you.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
12
               MR. GARRITY: I have no questions, thank you.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
14
               Next. Hi.
15
               THE JUROR: I got to apologize. I know that before
      was you guys called for, you know, if you have any like medical
16
17
      issues.
18
               THE COURT: Let me get your name.
19
               THE JUROR: Luis A. Soto, Jr. My issue is that I have
20
      sciatic pain, and if I sit for a long period of time, you know,
21
      that pain, it just bothers me, and sometimes I take like a
22
      medication, a muscle relaxer, and sometimes it gets me all,
23
      tired and I can't think sometimes straight, so like right now I
24
      was wondering if I could get Advil or something like that that
```

would help me. It's just starting to acting up.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

18

19

21

22

25

THE COURT: The longest we would sit is an hour and a half. We go from 9:00 to 10:30, take a short break, go to noon, take a short break and go to one. Is that too much for you? Could you get through that without being bothered or needing pain medication? THE JUROR: Well, with medication, I'll be fine or if I could stand up from time to time. THE COURT: What if I --THE JUROR: Just sitting too much. THE COURT: If I let you stand up and stretch, if you needed to, would that be enough? I'm just trying to explore. THE JUROR: Anything, I'll work around anything. That's one of my issues, and sometimes I take that medication and it just gets me tired, you know, extend the time. THE COURT: We would need you to be alert if you wound up on the jury. I wouldn't want you to take something that 17 would make it hard for you to concentrate. THE JUROR: If I could take some Advil, whatever, before, I would be fine, I just don't want it to start acting 20 up and then having to take that medication. THE COURT: Any follow-up questions? MR. WORTMANN: Well, I think what the Judge is saying, 23 any time you need to stand up and stretch, you could just do 24 it, and you think that would solve the problem? THE JUROR: For the most part, yes.

```
1
               MR. GARRITY: With the Advil it won't cause you any
      confusion or anything like that?
 2
               THE JUROR: No, I take that other muscle relaxer.
 3
               THE COURT: That could be a problem but not Advil?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: No, not Advil. I take it from time to
 6
      time, so, you know, it's been acting up lately, so I take that
 7
      medication at home, and sometimes I take it when I go to sleep
      and throughout the day, like one of my side effects that I've
 8
      had with that pill is, you know, I'm just tired all day and
 9
10
      can't concentrate as much.
11
               MR. WORTMANN: Mr. Soto, I wonder do you take it
12
      during work?
13
               THE JUROR: No, when I do take it, I have to excuse
14
      myself from work due to that because I can't, you know, think,
15
      I'm always tired. It keeps me tired for a long time.
16
               MR. WORTMANN: When is the last time you took
17
      something?
18
               THE JUROR: I took it about three months ago it's when
19
      it starts acting up or when I sit for a long time, you know, I
20
      go home, go to bed, the next morning all tight.
21
               THE COURT: Those hard wooden benches are bad.
22
      have at least a padding.
23
               THE JUROR: That's why I stand up because of that.
24
               THE COURT: Here's what I'm going to do: I'm going to
25
      leave you on for now, but if you wind up on the jury, don't
```

```
1
      suffer in silence, if you're feeling uncomfortable, you need to
      stretch, you need to take an Advil, let me know, and if you
 2
      feel you need to take a muscle relaxer, let me know, we'll work
 3
 4
      through it. The important thing is make sure you're talking to
 5
      me if you have a medical problem, promise me that?
 6
               THE JUROR: I'll promise.
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 7
               Sir.
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: Bernard Hogarty.
10
               THE COURT: Yes.
11
               THE JUROR: I have a nephew who just joined the Bourne
12
      Police Department, just graduated. His name is.
13
      Alan Florentine.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. Are you close to him?
15
               THE JUROR: Yeah, pretty much.
16
               THE COURT: And he's a rookie more or less, he just
17
      joined?
18
               THE JUROR: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that connection,
20
      relationship that would make it difficult for you to be a fair
21
      and impartial juror?
22
               THE JUROR: No, other than that I'm compelled to tell
23
      you if I'm related.
               THE COURT: That's fine.
24
25
               THE JUROR: That's the only issue.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Any follow-up?
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you.
 2.
               MR. GARRITY: No.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: Thank you.
               THE COURT: Next.
 7
               THE JUROR: Hi, Karin Sullivan.
               THE COURT: You're Number 41.
 8
               THE JUROR: I have another brother-in-law who was
 9
10
      pretty high up at the Capital Police force, but he has retired
11
      about six years ago.
12
               THE COURT: Is this one that used to be separate
13
      Capital Police in Boston?
14
               THE JUROR: No, in Washington.
1.5
               THE COURT: The same question, is there anything about
16
      that connection or relationship that would make it --
17
               THE JUROR: No.
18
               THE COURT: -- difficult for you to be a fair and
19
      impartial juror in this case?
20
               THE JUROR: No, no.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You might as well stay
22
      here.
23
               MR. WORTMANN: Are you going to ask a question about
24
      he's favorable or unfavorable at the police department?
25
               THE COURT: That's coming. I'm not done with my
```

```
1
      questions yet.
 2
               MR. WORTMANN:
                              Sorry.
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
 3
 4
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your
 5
      patience. Have you or any member of your immediate family or
 6
      any close friend ever been employed by a prosecutor's office or
      a public defender's office, a court, a probation office or a
 7
      prison or are any of you or any of those people currently
 8
 9
      applying or do you plan to apply to such an office or to a law
10
      enforcement agency? Okay. I'll see you.
11
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
12
                    What's your name?
               Hi.
1.3
               THE JUROR: Sarah Glick.
14
               THE COURT: Number 34. Yes.
               THE JUROR: My father was a public defender back
1.5
16
      before I was born.
17
               THE COURT: He was, but he's not anymore?
18
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
19
               THE COURT:
                           What does he do now?
20
               THE JUROR:
                          He's a lawyer.
21
               THE COURT: What kind of lawyer?
22
               THE JUROR: He works with elder law.
23
               THE COURT: Okay. And is there anything about that
24
      connection or relationship that would affect your ability to be
25
      a fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: No.
               THE COURT: You're confident you could be fair to both
 2
      sides?
 3
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Any follow-up, Mr. Wortmann?
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you.
               MR. GARRITY: No.
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
 9
               Next.
               THE JUROR: 29.
10
11
               THE COURT: Amy Spurling.
12
               THE JUROR: Yes. My cousin works for the Plymouth
13
      County Department of Corrections.
14
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, who?
               THE JUROR: My wife's cousin, and we are close.
15
16
               THE COURT: Plymouth House of Correction?
17
               THE JUROR: Yeah.
18
               THE COURT: And, again, is there anything about that
19
      connection or relationship that would affect your ability to be
      a fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case?
20
21
               THE JUROR: No.
22
               THE COURT: Are you confident you can be fair to both
23
      sides?
               THE JUROR: Yes.
24
25
               THE COURT: Any follow-up?
```

```
1
               MR. WORTMANN:
                              No.
               MR. GARRITY: If I could, just a few. You said your
 2.
      wife's cousin works for the Plymouth House of Correction.
 3
      that a he or a she?
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: It's a woman.
               THE COURT: Does she talk about her work at all?
               THE JUROR: No.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
 9
               Next. Number 12; is that right, Ms. Wilson?
10
               THE JUROR: Yes. My daughter's basketball coach is a
11
      prosecutor for the Massachusetts State Police.
12
               THE COURT: I think we asked about that last time.
1.3
               THE JUROR: Yes. I thought I'd come up.
14
               THE COURT: Any reason you couldn't be fair to both
15
      sides based on that relationship?
16
               THE JUROR: No.
17
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
18
               THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, if I
19
      asked a question and you came up and talked about a topic and
20
      the topic was covered by another question, you don't have to
21
      come up and repeat it. In other words, if we've touched on it
22
      once, you don't need to come up and say the same thing again.
23
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
24
               Next.
25
               THE JUROR: Hi, Rebecca Fagan, F-a-g-a-n.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: 30. Yes.
               THE JUROR: My sister in law's fiance' is an ADA on
 2
      the gun court somewhere in the city in the district court.
 3
               THE COURT: Sister-in-law's fiance' is a prosecutor on
 4
 5
      the gun court?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
               THE COURT:
                           Is this your brother's wife?
 7
               THE JUROR:
                          It's my husband's sister's fiance'.
 8
 9
               THE COURT:
                           Are you close to this person?
10
               THE JUROR:
                           I am.
11
               THE COURT:
                           That is not just your sister-in-law but
      the fiance'?
12
13
               THE JUROR:
                          Uh-hum.
14
               THE COURT: You have to answer yes for the record.
15
               THE JUROR: I'm sorry, yes.
16
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that connection or
      relationship that would affect your ability to be a fair and
17
18
      impartial juror in this case?
19
               THE JUROR: No, I don't think so.
20
               THE COURT: Are you confident you can be fair to both
21
      sides?
22
               THE JUROR: Yes.
23
               THE COURT: This case involves guns or a gun, I think.
24
      Obviously it has to be decided on its own merits, but, you
25
      know, whatever happens in those cases doesn't really have
```

```
1
      anything to do with, you know, what happened here. Are you
      confident you can be fair?
 2
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 3
               THE COURT: Can I ask what kind of -- you're an
 4
 5
      attorney?
               THE JUROR: Yes.
               THE COURT: What do you do?
 7
               THE JUROR: So for almost year I was a civil
 8
      litigator, now I do staffing and recruiting, so I've been doing
 9
10
      that for a year.
11
               THE COURT: What kind of civil litigation did you do?
12
               THE JUROR: Personal injury and med. mal.
13
               THE COURT: Plaintiff's side?
14
               THE JUROR: Plaintiff's side. I did some defense work
15
      as well.
16
               MR. WORTMANN: I'm sorry, what are you doing now?
17
               THE JUROR: I was staffing and recruiting.
18
               MR. WORTMANN: Okay, thanks.
19
               MR. GARRITY: No questions, your Honor.
20
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
21
               THE COURT: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, have any
22
      of you ever filed a lawsuit against any police officer or other
23
      law enforcement personnel? I see no hands.
24
               Have any of you had any kind of experience with the
25
      Boston Police Department, whether that experience is negative
```

or positive, that might interfere with or affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case? I don't see any hands.

Do any of you have any feelings or beliefs about law enforcement officers or other government agents, again, whether those are positive or negative that might interfere with or affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case? I see no hands.

Do any of you believe that law enforcement officers are more likely to tell the truth than other kinds of witnesses just because they're law enforcement officers or they're less likely to tell the truth than other witnesses, again, just because they're law enforcement officers? All right. I see no hands.

Have you or any member of your immediate family or any close friend ever been involved in a criminal matter, either as a defendant, a victim or a witness?

All right. I'll see you.

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)

THE JUROR: 29. My younger brother was incarcerated for five years on a ten-year term in a federal prison.

THE COURT: Okay. What was the charge?

THE JUROR: Drugs, possession and distribution.

THE COURT: And when was that, roughly?

THE JUROR: He's been out for six years now.

2.

1.5

```
1
               THE COURT: And he was incarcerated for five, did you
 2
      say?
               THE JUROR: Yeah.
 3
               THE COURT: And do you feel he was treated fairly by
 4
 5
      the criminal justice system?
 6
               THE JUROR: No, actually.
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's why I'm asking.
 7
                                                                 Ι
      don't want to belabor every detail.
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: Sure.
10
               THE COURT: Can you just give me a one-sentence answer
11
      why you think it was not fair?
12
               THE JUROR:
                           Sure. It was a military court case, there
13
      was no evidence. It wasn't a civilian world, they had no
14
      evidence and they convicted him for ten years with zero drug
15
      actual paraphernalia or drugs.
16
               THE COURT: And, again, this case has nothing to do
17
      with your brother's situation.
18
               THE JUROR: Correct.
19
               THE COURT: Or for that matter the military. Are you
20
      confident you can be fair to both sides?
21
               THE JUROR: I am.
22
               THE COURT: Again, you don't have to erase your life
23
      experience, but you do have to consider this case on its own
24
      merits or lack of merit, as the case may be.
```

THE JUROR: Yes, understood.

```
1
               MR. WORTMANN: Did you ever visit your brother while
      he was incarcerated?
 2.
               THE JUROR: I did.
 3
               MR. WORTMANN: Was there any long-lasting effect on
 4
 5
      you?
               THE JUROR: No.
               MR. GARRITY: No questions, thank you.
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
 9
               Next. Hi. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: Donna LaGrassa.
10
11
               THE COURT: Number 40. Yes.
               THE JUROR: My nephew, he just got out last year for
12
13
      breaking and entering.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. How long was he incarcerated?
15
               THE JUROR: I think it was like nine months.
16
               THE COURT: Do you feel he was treated fairly by the
17
      criminal justice system?
18
               THE JUROR: I believe so, yeah.
19
               THE COURT: Were you close to your nephew?
20
               THE JUROR: Not very.
21
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience
22
      that would affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror
23
      in the trial of this case?
24
               THE JUROR: No.
25
               THE COURT: You're confident you can be fair to both
```

```
1
      sides?
               THE JUROR: I believe so.
 2.
 3
               MR. WORTMANN: I don't mean to -- you seemed to
 4
      hesitate when asked if he was treated fairly. Are there some
 5
      things about it that you thought were not fair?
 6
               THE JUROR: No, I don't know enough about the case.
               MR. WORTMANN: Okay. Thank you.
 7
               MR. GARRITY: No questions.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Next. Hi. What's your name?
               THE JUROR: Michael DiCicco.
10
11
               THE COURT: Number 39.
               THE JUROR: So my brother was robbed at gunpoint about
12
13
      eight years back.
14
               THE COURT: And did they ever catch the person who did
15
      it?
16
               THE JUROR: Yeah, he wound up testifying, I didn't.
17
      My brother testified, yeah.
18
               THE COURT: Where did this happen?
19
               THE JUROR: Bentley College.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. And how long ago was it?
21
               THE JUROR: Probably between six to eight years, I
22
      would say.
23
               THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about that
24
      experience that would affect your ability to be a fair and
25
      impartial juror in the trial of this case?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: I'd say only if it's a similar situation,
      I think.
 2.
               THE COURT: Well, it's not a robbery, but the case
 3
      does involve guns, someone who's charged with illegally
 4
 5
      possessing a firearm and ammunition, and, you know, of course,
 6
      this case has nothing to do with your brother's case but do you
 7
      think it would affect you so that you'd have trouble being
 8
      fair?
 9
               THE JUROR: I don't think. If it wasn't a robbery, I
      don't think so.
10
11
               THE COURT: You think if it was a robbery, you might
12
      have some trouble?
1.3
               THE JUROR: Yeah.
14
               THE COURT: Any follow-up, Mr. Wortmann?
1.5
               MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.
17
               MR. GARRITY: Just given what happened to your
18
      brother, do guns in general cause you any concern?
19
               THE JUROR: No, I don't think so, no.
20
               THE COURT: Can I get you to step aside for a second,
21
      can I talk to the lawyers?
22
               THE JUROR: Sure.
23
               THE COURT: He's Number 39 on the list. I have some
24
      question here, but I'm inclined to leave him on but I might
25
      later strike him depending what it looks like, but I'm inclined
```

```
1
      to leave him on for now.
               MR. GARRITY: That's fine.
 2.
               MR. WORTMANN: I think he should be left on.
 3
               THE COURT: I'm going to leave you on the jury. I
 4
 5
      might very well visit this. You're pretty far down the list,
 6
      but if we got that far, I might bring you back up here, but why
      don't you take a seat and listen to the rest of my questions.
 7
               Next.
                     Hi.
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: Hi.
10
               THE COURT: Number 6. Yes.
11
               THE JUROR: 2008 or 9 two of my sons were victims of
12
      street violence, and the youngest one was being robbed in the
13
      hallway, and when the oldest one went downstairs to help him
14
      because he heard the screaming, he got stabbed in the back six
      times and my youngest one in the leg.
15
16
               THE COURT: Okay. Was a gun involved or just a knife?
17
               THE JUROR: Knife. The two kids that did it, they
18
      served time.
19
               THE COURT: Did your sons have to testify as
20
      witnesses?
21
               THE JUROR:
                          No.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. How old were they when that
23
      happened?
               THE JUROR: 16 and 20.
24
25
               THE COURT: And do you feel that your sons as victims
```

1 were treated fairly by the law enforcement system or the criminal justice system? 2. 3 THE JUROR: My sons were, yeah. 4 THE COURT: Do you think the perpetrators were treated 5 fairly? 6 THE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Why is that? 7 THE JUROR: They only served -- one of them, the one 8 9 that actually did the stabbing served 18 months in prison, and 10 the other one didn't serve any time at all. 11 THE COURT: Okay. This case obviously has nothing to 12 do with your son's situation. Do you think that experience 13 would affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in 14 the trial of this case? 1.5 THE JUROR: I don't think so, no. 16 THE COURT: I need you to be competent. You do not 17 have to erase your life experience. You are what you are, and you've been through what you have been through, but you do have 18 19 to be fair and decide this case on its own merits, in other 20 words, you can't say I'm going to convict this guy because the 21 guys who stabbed my sons, you know, got off lightly, you have 22 to separate this and decide this case on its own facts. Do you 23 understand that? 24 THE JUROR: I understand that and I feel like I could.

THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann.

1 MR. WORTMANN: Thank you.

2.

1.3

1.5

MR. GARRITY: No questions, thank you.

THE JUROR: Thanks.

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, the charge in this case is possession of a firearm and ammunition by someone who has previously been convicted of a certain kind of crime, a crime that carries a potential punishment of a year or more, more than a year.

The law says once you've been convicted of such a crime, I'm going to call it a felony for shorthand purposes, you cannot legally possess a gun or ammunition. If you do, that's a new crime. So the government expects to prove in this case that the defendant was previously convicted of a crime and that afterward he possessed a gun and ammunition.

Now, the fact that someone committed one crime does not mean that they committed another. There is a danger that a juror might not be fair knowing the fact that someone had been previously convicted of a crime. They might conclude that he's a bad person, that he has a bad character and convict on that basis instead of listening to that evidence and deciding the case on its own merits.

Everyone is entitled to a fair trial, everyone, even people with a prior criminal conviction, and it's improper or unfair to convict someone on the grounds that he must be a bad

person or he wouldn't have a record.

2.

1.3

1.5

With that as background, do any of you have any feelings or beliefs about the crime with which the defendant is charged and the fact that it involves a previous conviction that in some way might affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial juror in this case? Are you all confident you can be fair to him even if you learned that he has a prior conviction? All right. I see no hands.

Do any of you have strong feelings or opinions regarding guns or government regulation of guns or firearms or ammunition that would affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial juror in the trial of this case? I see no hands.

The defendant in this case is an African-American.

Again, both sides are entitled to a fair trial. Both sides are entitled to jurors with open minds and who will decide the case solely on the evidence and according to the law. It's particularly important, of course, that the defendant receive a fair trial. He's entitled to exactly the same degree of fairness and justice as any other person, not one bit less, and he must be considered as an individual and judged according to what he as an individual did or did not do.

It's difficult sometimes in our society for people to talk openly about issues such as this, to be honest and to be open about whatever feelings they may have on those subjects, but your duties and obligations as citizens and potential

jurors require you be completely honest with the Court.

2.

Do any of you have any feelings of any kind that might affect your ability in any way to be fair and impartial in this case because of the race or color of the defendant? I see no hands.

If you are not completely confident, if there's any doubt at all in your mind on these issues, please raise your hand. All right. I see no hands.

Do any of you feel that the defendant is more likely to have committed a crime because of his race or color? I see no hands.

Have any of you learned or heard anything about this case or the defendant before you came into court today? I see no hands.

The defendant has a constitutional right not to testify, and no inference of guilt or anything else may be drawn from the fact he does not testify. To draw such an inference would be wrong. In fact, it would violate your oath as a juror. Are there any of you who do not accept that basic principle concerning the defendant's rights not to testify and might hold it against him if in fact he does not testify? I see no hands.

The fact that the defendant has been charged with a crime is not evidence that he is guilty of the crime. He is presumed innocent, and the government has the burden of proving

his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.

Are there any of you who might have trouble accepting that basic principle concerning the presumption of innocence and the burden of proof? I see no hands.

All of you must decide the case solely on the evidence presented in this court. Are there any of you who might have trouble accepting that principle and might decide the case on something other than the evidence presented in this court and the laws as I instruct you? All right. I'll see you at sidebar.

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)

THE COURT: Ms. Fagan, Number 30.

THE JUROR: I was a juror earlier this year, and the one challenge I had was leaving out the things I already knew about evidence that weren't presented in the Court, so, for example, it was a DUI trial, and I knew refusal was involved, so the fact that it wasn't there, I had a hard time separating out what I already knew or think I know or remember from, you know, I wasn't, but it was one challenge that I had.

THE COURT: And did that affect your verdict at the end of the day? In other words, did you let that affect your decision?

THE JUROR: In that particular case, I know that I had a hard time separating out that I believed that he refused based on my knowledge of those things generally, but I could do

1 my best. THE COURT: Okay. Any question, Mr. Wortmann? 2. MR. WORTMANN: Could you tell us a little bit more how 3 4 it was, whether the same thing would happen here. 5 THE JUROR: Sure. I don't know anything about gun possession laws or anything like that. Like I said, I mean anything I know about evidence was from law school, so it's 7 almost things I think or know or what I think I remember that 8 9 was in that just one case I found it especially in deliberating 10 in the jury room when people were talking about the 11 breathalyzer and refusal to blow and stuff like that I didn't 12 say anything because I knew it's how the Judge instructs you. 1.3 THE COURT: Obviously, in addition to considering the 14 case evidence, you also have to follow the law as I instruct you, and if you think it's different or wrong, do you have any 1.5 16 trouble in that regard? 17 THE JUROR: No. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Garrity, any questions? 19 MR. GARRITY: I have no questions. 20 THE COURT: Can you step aside for a second and let me 21 talk to the lawyers. I'm not quite sure what to do here. 22 may not reach her. What do counsel think? 23 MR. WORTMANN: It's enough of a concern, your Honor, 24 given the fact that we have plenty of numbers I think I'd 25 excuse her.

MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, I don't think she said -- I think she said in that particular case she had some knowledge. It sounds like an OUI case. She said she had no information with respect to gun laws, so I don't think and she did say she didn't interfere with the jury deliberation process.

THE COURT: Right.

2.

MR. GARRITY: With her specialized knowledge so I don't think it's an issue.

THE COURT: Why don't we do this. I'm going to leave her on for now, and I'll revisit it if we get to it. I'm going to bring her back and talk to her right now.

Ms. Fagan. All right. I'm going to leave you on the jury panel for now. We might not reach you. If we do reach you, I might bring you back up here and follow-up on some of this.

Let me re-emphasize, it's possible that something might come up in the course of this trial that triggers something that you think you remember from first year criminal law or something, I don't know, and it is critically important that every juror decide the case on the evidence or lack of evidence presented in the case and the law as I instruct it.

So, for example, so let's say I exclude something and you think you might know what that might have been or you think you might be able to figure out what I'm doing, you can't speculate about what that evidence might have been or, you

know, whether my ruling was right or wrong, you just have to accept it. Are you prepared to do that?

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't you take your seat, and we will see how this plays out. Again, you might not get picked at all.

MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, one question I had with the racial questions going to be asked at sidebar.

THE COURT: I said I would do it with the 14.

MR. WORTMANN: Well, your Honor, when you do it, you could follow up. At least one of the witnesses is likely to be African-American as well.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, do any of you have any feelings or beliefs about the government, whether those feelings or beliefs are positive or negative that might affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial juror? I see no hands.

Do any of you have any feelings about lawyers or Judges or the criminal justice system, again, whether those feelings are positive or negative that might affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial juror? I see no hands.

Do any of you have any political or religious or ethical beliefs that might interfere? I don't know want to know your politics or your religious beliefs unless those

```
1
      beliefs could somehow interfere with your ability to follow the
      law as I instruct you and to render a fair verdict in this
 2.
      case? I see no hands.
 3
               Are you aware of any beliefs or feelings that would
 4
 5
      prevent you from completely and honestly applying the law as I
 6
      give it to you at the end of the case to the facts as you find
      them? I see no hands.
 7
               Do you know of any reason that has not been mentioned
 8
 9
      why you cannot sit as a fair and impartial juror in the trial
10
      of this case? All right. I'll see you.
11
               Let me ask a follow-up question. Is there anything
12
      like that I've not asked you before we go any further?
13
      Sir, I'll see you.
14
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
1.5
               THE COURT: What's your name?
16
               THE JUROR: Carlos Pereira.
               THE COURT: I'm sorry.
17
18
               THE JUROR: Carlos Pereira.
19
               THE CLERK:
                           15.
                           15. Yes, sir.
20
               THE COURT:
21
               THE JUROR: Language is not for me.
22
               THE COURT: Is English your second language?
23
               THE JUROR: Yes.
24
               THE COURT:
                           Is your first language Spanish or
25
      Portuguese?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: Portuguese.
               THE COURT: Are you having a little bit of trouble
 2
      following this?
 3
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: I think probably we will, unless someone
 6
      wants to explore this further, I think probably the thing to do
 7
      is to let you go so you don't have to serve.
               MR. WORTMANN: Agree, your Honor.
 8
 9
               MR. GARRITY: That will be fine.
10
               THE COURT: I'm going to let you go. Thank you, have
11
      a good holiday.
12
                           Thank you, your Honor.
               THE JUROR:
13
                          Next. Hi. Your name?
               THE COURT:
14
               THE JUROR: Smykal. Sorry, I was nervous the first
15
      time.
16
               THE COURT: 36.
17
               THE JUROR: I have two jobs, they're both per diem,
18
      which means I don't accrue any sick or vacation time or get
19
      paid for jury duty, so I am scheduled to work that Monday and
20
      Wednesday, so if I don't go, I don't get paid even if I have
21
      any personal time, which I don't.
22
               THE COURT: Where physically do you work?
23
               THE JUROR: I work two places, I work at Boston
24
      Children's Hospital as a pediatric nurse, and I work at
25
      St. Elizabeth's Medical Center as an adult psychiatric nurse.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Okay. Like I say, we'll see if we get to
      you. There's one advantage of quitting each day quite promptly
 2.
               Sometimes people can work shifts or half days or do
 3
      things getting out at one that you might be able to trade a
 4
      shift. You're an R.N.; is that right?
               THE JUROR: They do 12-hour shifts, so they're 7 to 6,
      no half shifts.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. Any follow-up?
 8
 9
               MR. WORTMANN: No.
10
               MR. GARRITY: No, thank you.
11
               MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, for what it's worth given
12
      sort of the number of things where she sits on the list, I'd be
13
      inclined to let her go.
14
               THE COURT: I think we will probably get to that.
                              I think you're probably right.
15
               MR. WORTMANN:
16
               THE COURT: Any follow-up questions on the voir dire
      before we begin the peremptory process?
17
18
               MR. WORTMANN: You know, I wondered if the person who
19
      had the language because that is something I was going to ask,
20
      if anyone has any problems.
21
               THE COURT: I always feel like the card in the seat
22
      pocket.
23
               MR. WORTMANN:
                              I hear you.
24
               THE COURT: The card in the seat pocket, if you can't
25
      read this, call a flight attendant. Other than that,
```

1 Mr. Garrity? MR. GARRITY: I'm fine with that. 2. 3 THE COURT: What I'm going to do is let them have a 4 break, a bathroom break, and we'll start the process. 5 MR. WORTMANN: We're going to put the first 14 on the list? 6 7 THE COURT: The first 14 on the list will be put in the box. 8 9 (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.) 10 THE COURT: One follow-up question, ladies and 11 gentlemen. Do any of you have such language problems or you 12 have fear that you have trouble following the trial? I see no 1.3 hands. 14 What we're going to do now, I'm going to give you a very, very quick and short break so you can use the facilities. 15 I don't want you to go anywhere other than the restroom. 16 17 of you who smoke will be tempted to go downstairs. You cannot 18 do that. I don't want you to leave this floor. I want to make 19 this as quick and orderly as possible, and we can't start until 20 100 percent of you are back in the room, so make this, again, 21 as quick and orderly as you can. The bathrooms are down the 22 hall. I will see you in hopefully about 5 or 10 minutes. 23 (A recess was taken.) 24 THE CLERK: All rise. You can be seated. 25 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, thank

you for your cooperation. What we're going to do next is the clerk is going to read out the names of 14 people and those people will take a seat in the jury box. The first name called out will sit in seat Number 1, which is the one closest to me in the front row here, and we'll go 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. The 8th name will be behind juror Number 1, and we'll have 14 names, and we'll begin the process of going through the peremptory challenges.

THE CLERK: Juror Number 1, seat Number 1, Warren

Kosterman; Juror Number 4, seat Number 2, Sean Goncalves; juror

Number 5, seat Number 3, Lee Britton; juror Number 6, seat

Number 4, Rosa Montalvo; juror Number 7, seat Number 5, Alden

Pierce; juror Number 8, seat Number 6, Nicole Arsenault; juror

Number 9, seat Number 7, Elizabeth Freeto; juror Number 10,

seat Number 8, Mary Jacobsen; juror Number 11, seat Number 9,

Nancy Groden; juror Number 12, seat Number 10, Maria Elena

Wilson; juror Number 13, seat Number 11, Dana Raines, Sr.;

juror Number 14, seat 12, Bridget Garabedian; juror Number 16,

seat Number 13, Linda Araujo; juror Number 17, seat Number 14,

Luis Soto.

THE COURT: All right. I think actually, sorry, before you get settled, can I get everyone to move over so that 8 is behind 1. Sorry about that. All right. Great.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me ask some follow-up questions. I'm going to try to fill in some blanks on the

```
form. I'm going to ask some of you whether you're married.
 1
      I'm not doing that to pry, because if you have a spouse, the
 2
 3
      lawyers are entitled to know what your spouse does for a
 4
      living.
 5
               Let me just go down the list. Mr. Goncalves, are you
      married?
 6
 7
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
               THE COURT: Mr. Britton, are you married?
 8
 9
               THE JUROR: Engaged.
10
               THE COURT:
                           I'm sorry.
11
               THE JUROR:
                           Engaged.
12
               THE COURT:
                           Engaged. What does your fiancee' do?
13
               THE JUROR:
                           She works at Boston Savings.
14
               THE COURT:
                           Ms. Montalvo, are you married?
15
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
               THE COURT: Ms. Arsenault, are you married?
16
17
               THE JUROR:
                           Engaged.
18
                           What does your fiance' do?
               THE COURT:
19
               THE JUROR: Public schoolteacher.
                          Ms. Jacobsen, are you presently employed?
20
               THE COURT:
21
               THE JUROR: No.
22
               THE COURT: Are you retired?
23
               THE JUROR: Yes.
24
               THE COURT: What did you retire from?
25
               THE JUROR: Warehouse work.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Your spouse is retired as well?
               THE JUROR:
 2
                           Yes.
               THE COURT:
                           Where did he work as well?
 3
               THE JUROR: He worked warehouse work as well.
 4
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Mr. Raines, are you married?
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           What does your spouse do?
               THE JUROR:
                           Unemployed.
 8
                           What was her last work?
 9
               THE COURT:
10
               THE JUROR:
                           She worked at Mass. Housing.
11
               THE COURT: Ms. Araujo, are you married?
12
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
13
               THE COURT:
                          Mr. Soto, are you married?
14
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
15
               THE COURT: Let me ask the 14 of you, have any of you
      ever served before on any kind of jury, civil or criminal, and,
16
17
      if so, I'll raise your hand and I'll go one-by-one, tell me
18
      quickly what kind of case it was. Yes.
19
               THE JUROR: Murder conviction.
20
               THE COURT:
                          I'm sorry.
21
               THE JUROR: Murder conviction.
22
               THE COURT: Yes.
23
               THE JUROR: Robbery case.
               THE JUROR: One civil and three criminal.
24
25
               THE COURT: Okay. When was the one most recent one of
```

```
1
      those?
               THE JUROR: March.
 2.
 3
               THE COURT: In the back, yes?
               THE JUROR: Motor vehicle.
 4
 5
               THE JUROR: Two, one was rape, and another one was
      motor vehicle.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: In the back?
               THE JUROR: Drunk driving.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Okay. Did I get everybody? One more
10
      thing I want to do, I'm going to call you up one-by-one to
11
      follow up on one of my questions. I'll just take you one at a
12
      time. Mr. Kosterman, I'll get you first.
1.3
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
14
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kosterman, I asked
15
      everyone in open court a question about race and whether it
16
      might affect their decision in any way or affect the trial in
17
      any way, and I want to give everyone a chance not in front of
18
      everyone to answer the same question.
19
               Is there any way in which the race of the defendant or
      any of the witnesses might affect your ability to be a fair and
20
21
      impartial juror in this case?
22
               THE JUROR: No way it would be affected.
23
               THE COURT: Thank you.
24
               THE JUROR: Thank you.
25
               THE COURT: Mr. Gonsalves.
```

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)

1.5

THE COURT: I think it would be actually faster, you might line up, it might save you a couple minutes. Thank you.

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)

THE COURT: Mr. Goncalves, I asked everyone whether race would affect their decision in any way, and I want to give everyone an opportunity one-on-one to answer the same question. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: Absolutely not.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Britt, I asked everyone in open court about whether race might affect their verdict in any way, and I want to give everyone an individual opportunity to do that. Is there anything in any way in which the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses might affect your verdict in this case in any way?

THE JUROR: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Montalvo, I asked everyone in open court about race and whether it might affect the verdict in any way. I want to give everyone a chance to do that, to answer that question individually. Is there anything in this case about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

1 THE COURT: Thank you.

2.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Pierce, I asked everyone in open court about the subject of race and whether it would affect their verdict in any way, and I want to give everyone an opportunity to do that one-on-one. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or race of any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Arsenault, I asked everyone in open court whether race might in any way affect their verdict in this case. I'm giving everyone a chance to answer this question one-on-one. Is there anything at all about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in this case in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Freeto, I asked everyone this question in open court, and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one. I asked about race and whether it might affect the verdict in any way. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.

1 THE JUROR: Thank you.

2.

1.5

THE COURT: Ms. Jacobson, I asked everyone this question in open court, and I want to give everyone a chance to answer the same question one-on-one. I asked about whether the race of the defendant might in any way affect your verdict in this case. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Groden, I asked everyone this question in open court, and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer the same question one-on-one. I had asked about the race of the defendant and whether it might affect the verdict. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Wilson, I asked everyone this question in open court, and I'm going to give everyone a chance to answer the same question one-on-one, and that was about the race of the defendant and whether it might affect the verdict. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

2.

1.5

Mr. Raines, I asked this question in open court to everyone, and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one. The question was about race. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to return a fair and impartial verdict in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Garabedian, I asked this question to everyone in open court, and I'm giving everyone a chance one-on-one to answer the same question, and that was about the race of the defendant or the race of any of the witnesses with whom it might affect the trial. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race about any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Ms. Araujo, I asked this question to everyone in open court and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer the same question now one-on-one. And that was about the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the race of the defendant or any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Soto.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: I asked everyone this question in open court, and I want to give them an opportunity to answer the same question one-on-one, and that was about the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your verdict in any way in this case?

THE JUROR: (Witness nodding head.)

THE COURT: You have to say yes or no.

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

All right. Let's begin the process of the peremptory challenges. I want to remind everyone, we're going to proceed by rounds. Actually, why don't you all come around here. We do it one-by-one. The government will go first in the first round, then the defendant, and the government and the defendant, we'll switch, the defendant will go first in the second round and so on.

The government gets seven peremptory challenges, the defense has eleven, the last two jurors seated regardless of their seat, that is, the last two impaneled will be the alternates, and the 7 and 11 peremptory challenges can be used without regard whether it's the last two seats or not.

All right.

```
1
               MR. WORTMANN: May I have a moment, your Honor?
               THE COURT: Yes.
 2.
               MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, the government challenges
 3
      juror Wilson, that's Number 12 sitting in seat Number 10.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Juror 12, seat 10. All right.
      Mr. Garrity.
               MR. GARRITY: We challenge juror Number 1 in seat 1.
               THE COURT: Juror 1 in seat 1. The government.
 8
 9
               MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, Garabedian, seat 12, juror
      Number 14.
10
11
               THE COURT: Did you say 14, seat 12, Garabedian?
12
               MR. WORTMANN: Yes.
13
               THE COURT: Defense.
14
               MR. GARRITY: Juror Number 9 in seat 7.
15
               THE COURT: Ms. Freeto?
16
               MR. GARRITY: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: Juror 9, seat 7. All right.
18
      government.
19
               MR. WORTMANN: Juror Number 17 in seat 14, Mr. Soto.
20
               THE COURT: Juror 17, seat 14. Okay. Defense.
21
               MR. GARRITY: Juror 10 in seat 8.
22
               THE COURT: That's Ms. Jacobsen, juror 10, seat 8.
23
      Okay.
24
               MR. WORTMANN: The government is content, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Anything more from the defense in this
```

```
1
      round?
               MR. GARRITY: Yes, your Honor, juror Number 11.
 2.
               THE COURT: In seat 13, Mr. Raines?
               MR. GARRITY: Oh, I'm sorry, Judge, juror Number 11.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: That's juror Number 9 -- you're right,
      juror Number 11, seat 9.
               MR. GARRITY: Seat 9, yes.
 7
               And juror 14 was stricken by the government?
 8
 9
               MR. WORTMANN: Yes.
10
               MR. GARRITY: Juror Number 16.
11
               THE COURT: In seat 13?
12
               MR. GARRITY: Yes, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Okay.
14
               MR. GARRITY: And other than that, we're content.
15
               THE COURT: So the government has used three, you have
16
      four left. The defense has used five, so they have six left,
      and we'll replace those eight jurors.
17
18
               MR. WORTMANN: Thank you, your Honor.
19
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
20
               THE CLERK: Juror 10, Mary Jacobsen, you're excused,
21
      you're seat 8. Juror Number 1, Larry Kosterman, you're
22
      excused. Juror Number 11, Nancy Groden, you're excused. Juror
23
      Number 16, Linda Araujo, you're excused. Juror Number 12,
24
      Maria Elena Wilson, you're excused. Juror Number 14, Bridget
25
      Garabedian, you're excused. Juror Number 9, Elizabeth Freeto,
```

```
1
      you're excused. Juror Number 17, Mr. Soto, you're excused.
 2
               THE COURT: All right. The clerk will now read off
 3
      eight more names.
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 18, Brittany Ferreira, seat
 4
 5
      Number 1; juror Number 19, Richard Scola, seat Number 7; juror
 6
      Number 21, Mark Willis, seat Number 8; directly behind
      Number 1, juror Number 22, Brian Hogan, seat Number 9; juror
 7
      Number 23, Carol Garneau, seat Number 10; juror Number 25,
 8
 9
      Anthony Gennaoui, seat Number 12; juror Number 26, Bernard
10
      Hogarty, seat Number 13; juror Number 27, Cheryl Segreve, seat
11
      Number 14.
               THE COURT: All right. Let me ask the new jurors,
12
13
      Ms. Ferreira, are you married?
14
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Scola, are you married?
16
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
                          What does your spouse do?
17
               THE COURT:
                           She's retired.
18
               THE JUROR:
19
               THE COURT:
                           What did she retire from?
20
                           Medical field.
               THE JUROR:
21
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. What about you, what do you do?
22
               THE JUROR:
                           I'm retired from the Boston Globe.
23
               THE COURT:
                           Mr. Willis, are you married?
24
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
25
               THE COURT: Ms. Garneau, is your spouse -- you're
```

```
1
      married, correct?
 2.
               THE JUROR: I'm married, yes.
               THE COURT: Does your spouse work?
 3
               THE JUROR: He's retired.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: What did he retire from?
               THE JUROR: Post office.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. Let me ask the eight new
      jurors, have you ever served on a jury of any kind before?
 8
                                                                  Can
 9
      I get you to give a brief description?
10
               THE JUROR: Three civil, last one about five years
11
      ago.
12
               THE JUROR: Drunk driving and firearms.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. When was the firearm case?
14
               THE JUROR: 2012.
15
               THE COURT: Okay. Was it in state court or federal
16
      court?
17
               THE JUROR: It was in Brockton.
18
               THE COURT: Brockton, okay.
19
               THE JUROR: A stabbing.
20
               THE COURT: A stabbing case. Can I get the eight new
21
      jurors to line up and beginning with Number 1, let me see you
22
      at sidebar.
23
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
24
               THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ferreira, I asked this
25
      question in open court, but I'm giving you another chance to
```

also talk about it one-on-one, and that concerns the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race of the other witnesses that might affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

2.

1.5

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Scola.

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: I asked this question -- can I get you to back up just a hair. Thank you. I asked this question in open court to everyone, and I'm asking it again one-on-one, and that is concerning the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the defendant's race or race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be a fair juror in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Willis, I asked this question to everyone in open court. I'm asking it again one-on-one, and that's about the defendant's race. Is there anything about the race of the defendant, the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Hogan, I asked this question to everyone in open court, and I'm asking it again one-on-one. That concerns the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race of any of the

witnesses that would affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

2.

1.3

1.5

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Ms. Garneau, I asked this question to everyone in open court, and I'm asking it again one-on-one so people have a chance to respond, and that concerns the race of the defendant. Is there anything about his race or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case?

THE JUROR: Not at all.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Gennaoui, I asked this question in open court. I'm giving everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one as well. That concerns the race of the defendant. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Hogarty, I asked this question in open court to everyone, and I'm going to give everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one, and that concerns the defendant's race. Is there anything about the defendant's race or the race of any of the witnesses that might affect your ability to be fair and impartial?

THE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

```
1
               THE JUROR: This thing isn't working too good. Do you
      want it back?
 2.
 3
               THE COURT: We'll try to see if we can get it to work
 4
      and get you a better one.
 5
               Ms. Segreve, I asked this question in open court to
      everyone, and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer it
      one-on-one. That concerns the race of the defendant. Is there
 7
      anything about the defendant's race or the race of any of the
 8
 9
      witnesses that might affect your ability to be fair and
10
      impartial in this case?
11
               THE JUROR: No.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
13
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
14
               THE COURT: Counsel, do you need a few moments?
1.5
               MR. GARRITY: Can I have a few minutes?
16
               THE COURT: Yes. Are you ready, counsel?
17
               MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, can I have one more minute?
18
               THE COURT: Yes.
19
               MR. GARRITY: Thank you.
20
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS HELD AS FOLLOWS:)
21
               THE COURT: All right. Counsel. This is round 2.
22
      The defense will go first. Mr. Garrity.
23
               MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, we will strike juror 26.
24
               THE COURT: Seat 13, Mr. Hogarty.
25
               MR. GARRITY: Yes. Mr. Wortmann.
```

```
1
               MR. WORTMANN: Juror 18, seat 1, Ms. Ferreira.
               THE COURT: Juror 18, seat 1. Mr. Garrity.
 2
               MR. GARRITY: On that, we're content, your Honor.
 3
               MR. WORTMANN: The government is content, your Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: All right. That will mean that the next
 6
      two people will be the alternates. We'll put Matthew Duggan
 7
      and Amy Spurling as 28 and 29 and see if we get to Ms. Fagan.
      She's the one who was the lawyer. Okay.
 8
 9
               (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)
10
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 18, Ms. Ferreira, you're
11
      dismissed. Juror Number 26, Mr. Hogarty, you're dismissed.
12
      Thank you.
13
               THE COURT: The clerk will read out two more names.
14
               THE CLERK: Could we have juror Number 28, Matthew
15
      Duggan, seat Number 1 and juror 29, Amy Spurling, seat
16
      Number 13.
17
               THE COURT: Actually, no, I'm sorry, Mr. Duggan, are
18
      you married?
19
               THE JUROR: No, sir.
20
               THE COURT: And the two new jurors, have either of you
21
      ever sat on a jury of any kind before?
22
               THE JUROR: Yes.
23
               THE COURT: What kind of case?
24
               THE JUROR: It was criminal, a gun charge.
25
               THE COURT: Which court?
```

1 THE JUROR: State court. 2. THE COURT: Are counsel ready? (THE FOLLOWING OCCURRED AT SIDEBAR:) 3 THE COURT: All right. This is round 3. 4 5 government goes first. Mr. Wortmann. MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, are we going to bring them 7 up? (SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.) 8 9 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Can I bring the two of you up. 10 Mr. Duggan, I've asked this question in open court, but I'm 11 also giving everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one, and that 12 concerns the race of the defendant. Is there anything about 13 the defendant's race or the race of any of the witnesses in the 14 case that might affect your ability to be a fair and impartial 1.5 juror in this case? 16 THE JUROR: Irrelevant. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Spurling, I asked 18 this question to everyone in open court, but I'm also giving 19 everyone a chance to answer it one-on-one. That concerns the 20 defendant's race. Is there anything about the defendant's race 21 or the race of any of the witnesses that would affect your 22 ability to be a fair and impartial juror in this case? 23 THE JUROR: No. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. Do you need a moment or are 25 you ready?

1 MR. GARRITY: One moment, Judge. 2. THE COURT: Okay. 3 MR. GARRITY: We're content, your Honor. MR. WORTMANN: The government challenges 29, 4 5 Ms. Spurling. THE COURT: The government challenges juror 29 in seat 13. Any other challenges? 7 MR. WORTMANN: No. 8 9 THE COURT: That means we have to make a decision 10 about Ms. Fagan. Do you want me to do another colloquy with 11 She's the attorney who said that in her drunk driving 12 case, she had some trouble separating out what she knew about 13 breathalyzer tests, or at least I think that's a fair 14 characterization, she had some trouble. I think at the end of 1.5 the day, she said she could make that separation. Do you want me to do further inquiry of her? You both have a multitude of 16 17 unused peremptory challenges, or do I have to decide I have to 18 strike her for cause? What's the government's view? 19 MR. WORTMANN: I think she can stay on, your Honor. 20 MR. GARRITY: I think so, too, Judge. 21 THE COURT: All right. Then we'll call her up. 22 THE CLERK: Juror Number 29, Amy Spurling, you're 23 dismissed. Juror Number 30, Rebecca Fagan. 24 THE COURT: Actually, Ms. Fagan, why don't you come 25 right to sidebar.

1 (THE FOLLOWING OCCURRED AT SIDEBAR:) THE COURT: I asked this question in open court to 2. everyone, and I'm giving everyone a chance to answer it 3 one-on-one. It concerns the race of the defendant. Is there 4 5 anything about his race or the race of any of the witnesses 6 that would affect your ability to serve as a fair and impartial 7 juror in this case? 8 THE JUROR: No. 9 THE COURT: Let me ask another follow-up, which is we 10 talked about this previous case you had, the drunk driving 11 case, and how your legal training at least gave you a little 12 bit of trouble separating out some of the evidentiary issues, 13 and you've had a chance I guess to think about that a little 14 bit. Is there anything you want to follow up or clarify? 15 THE JUROR: No. 16 THE COURT: Are you confident you could be fair in this case and decide this case on the evidence? 17 18 THE JUROR: I think so. 19 THE COURT: Any follow-up, counsel? 20 MR. WORTMANN: No, thank you, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Other than that, have you served on a 22 jury? 23 THE JUROR: No, just that one. 24 THE COURT: Why don't you take your seat. 25 All right. Round 4. So the defense would have to go

1 first. MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, we're content. 2. MR. WORTMANN: We're content, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. So hold on. So Ms. Fagan and 4 5 Mr. Duggan are the alternates. I'm not going to take them off 6 or tell them until the end of the trial. Normally, at this point, I would swear the jury and discharge everyone else. 7 I've been wrestling with this and talking to other 8 9 Judges, and there's two schools of thought equally divided in 10 terms of what way to go. The advantage of swearing them is 11 they know, you know, they're under oath and they have to follow 12 my instructions strictly. The advantage of not swearing them 13 is jeopardy hasn't attached, and in the two-week gap, if 14 something were to happen, it's hard to foresee exactly how this 1.5 would play out but, in any event, jeopardy wouldn't have 16 attached. What's the government's view? 17 MR. WORTMANN: I don't think you could swear the jury 18

MR. WORTMANN: I don't think you could swear the jury just because of that possibility. I think if we suddenly had a block of witnesses and something there would be manifest in any way, but I think to avoid that problem.

THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, I would ask that you swear them in because that will emphasize with them that they have to follow the Court's instructions, and we do have two alternates so I can't foresee a two-week delay talking about a mistrial or

a lack of jurors.

2.

1.5

THE COURT: It's not at all clear to me what the right thing to do is, but I'm going to tip the balance by doing what defense counsel asked, so we'll swear the jury.

(SIDEBAR CONFERENCE WAS CONCLUDED.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I declare that we have a jury indifferent, which means you're going to be the jury in the case. I need you to all stand and be sworn in as the jury in this case.

(Jurors were sworn.)

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. The rest of you are discharged. Thank you for your patience. I hope you all have a great holiday. Those of you who are worried about your schedule are off the hook, so thank you. I know the benches are hard and wooden. They are that way in every courtroom, old and new, I don't know why, but thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me talk about a few things. I'm going to take a few moments and talk about your duties as jurors and give you some preliminary instructions, and then we'll talk about logistics.

As I said, we're going to take two weeks off and come back after the holidays, but let me start by giving you again some instructions on your duties and obligations. I'm also going to give you some brief preliminary instructions on the law that you're to follow.

At the end of the trial, I'm going to give you a complete and detailed set of instructions on the law. Those instructions will be in writing. Each of you will have your own copy to read along as I give you the instructions and to take with you into the jury room.

The reasons I'm going to give you some instruction now instead of waiting to the end of the trial is to try to give you a bit of the framework for considering the evidence and to help you understand it. I don't want you to think my preliminary instructions are somehow more important than the ones that come later. You must apply the instructions I give you at the end of the trial as a whole.

As the jury, it is your duty to decide from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the judges of the facts. You will hear the evidence, decide what the facts are and then apply those facts to the law as I give it to you. You must follow the law as I explain it whether you agree with it or not.

Sometimes jurors are curious about what I think, whether I think, for example, that the defendant is guilty or not or whether I think a particular witness is believable. My opinion, if I have one, and I certainly don't have one now, is not relevant. It is your role, not mine, to decide those issues, and you should not interpret anything I might say or do during the trial about what I think about a witness or what I

think your verdict ought to be.

2.

1.5

Again, this is a criminal case. The defendant has been charged with one crime, possession of a firearm and ammunition by a person who has been previously convicted of a crime punishable by more than a year.

The charge against the defendant is contained in a document called an indictment. The indictment is simply a description of the charge against him. It's not evidence of anything. Mr. Belin has pleaded not guilty to the charge. He is presumed innocent. The government must prove his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. The defendant does not have to prove his innocence, he does not have to put on any evidence, he does not have to testify. Those are rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

At the end of the trial, you'll be asked to render a verdict of guilty or not guilty. Your verdict must be unanimous. That is, you may not convict the defendant if only one of you agrees that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

In order to help you follow the evidence, I'm going to give a brief summary of the elements of the crime charged.

Every crime has what we call elements. Those are things that the government has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt in order to find the defendant guilty of that particular crime.

I'll instruct on the elements of the crime later in greater detail at the end of the case, and, again, the

2.

1.3

instructions you get at the end of the case, which will be more detailed, will govern your deliberations.

The crime charged is possession of a firearm and ammunition after a previous conviction for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year. The elements of that crime are as follows:

First, that the defendant was convicted in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year;

Second, that the defendant possessed a firearm or ammunition after that conviction occurred;

Third, that the defendant acted knowingly; and Fourth, that the firearm or ammunition moved in interstate commerce after it was manufactured.

That is just a very preliminary outline. At the end of the trial, I'll give you a final instruction on all the things you need to know, including definitions of important terms, and those instructions will govern your deliberations.

I've talked about the word "evidence." The evidence in this case will probably include the testimony of witnesses. It will include objects and things received as exhibits, it may include documents and any facts upon which the parties might agree. The evidence consists of all the testimony, both on direct and cross-examination and all the exhibits regardless of who introduced them.

2.

1.3

1.5

There are rules that control what you may consider as evidence. When a lawyer asks a question or offers something into evidence, if the other lawyer on the other side thinks it's not permitted by the rules, that lawyer might object. Sometimes it's necessary for me to discuss the issue with the lawyers outside the hearing of the jury either by having a conference at the sidebar or by calling a recess.

The purpose of those conferences is so I can make a decision on the rules of evidence. We don't keep things from you just to frustrate you, but sometimes it's important to discuss things outside your earshot, and I will do what I can to keep those conferences to a minimum.

Certain things are not evidence. Statements and arguments by the lawyers are not evidence. The lawyers are not the witnesses. Questions by lawyers standing alone are not evidence. Again, the lawyers are not the witness, it's the question and the answer taken together that are the evidence.

Objections are not evidence. Lawyers have a duty to their client to object if they think there's something improper. If I sustain an objection, in other words, if I agree with the lawyer's objection and I keep something out, you must ignore the question or ignore the exhibit, and don't speculate what the answer might have been or the exhibit might have said. If I tell you to disregard something, it's not evidence, and you may not consider it. If you see or hear

anything outside the case, it's not evidence.

2.

1.3

1.5

Sometimes evidence comes in for a limited purpose only. You can use it for one purpose and not for any other. If that happens, I'll give you an instruction on the ways in which you can and cannot use the evidence.

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe everything a witness says or only part of it or none of it. It's entirely up to you.

Now, many people watch television shows or movies about courts or lawyers about the criminal justice system, and sometimes they're affected by that when they serve as jurors. Television shows and movies can create false expectations about real life, for example, how a trial is going to proceed or what the evidence is going to look like.

You must decide the case on the evidence before you and the law as I give it to you. Do not decide this case even in part based on something you saw on television or in a movie. That's improper and unfair.

Now, to make sure that the trial is fair, we have rules that the jury has to follow. These rules are important. I'm going to instruct you to follow these rules. The first rule is do not talk among ourselves about the case or about anyone involved with it until the end of case when you go to the jury room to decide on your verdict.

2.

1.3

1.5

You can feel free to get to know one another. You can talk about the weather or your families or the Patriots or anything other than this case. What we don't want is for people to start having side discussions with one another, particularly where two people begin to talk about whether or not they think the case ought to be decided in a certain way outside the hearing of the others and before all the evidence has come in. So, again, don't talk about the case among yourselves until it's time to do so.

The second rule is don't make up your mind about what the verdict ought to be until you've gone to the jury room to decide the case and you and your fellow jurors have discussed the evidence. The evidence has to be heard in some order. Something has to go first, something has to go last, and it may be that the last answer and the last question are the most important things for trial.

Third, don't talk with anyone else about this case.

Now, when I say don't talk with anyone else, that includes members of your family and your friends. It's the most natural thing in the world when you go home to talk to your wife or husband or roommate about the case. They'll say: What kind of case is it? Do you think he's guilty or they'll talk about some other case that they heard about or read about. It's natural for them to do that, but you should not have that conversation with someone who has not heard the evidence and is

2.

1.5

not part of this case and is not familiar with what that evidence is or how the case ought to be decided, and you cannot have that conversation. You can tell them that I told you so, you can talk about it after the case is over, but say the Judge told me I can't talk about the case until it's over.

Next, do not mention or discuss this case in any way on any social network or in any electronic forum. This is an increasing problem for the courts. Most, a lot of people, anyway, in modern life talk about things on their Facebook accounts or similar things, and if you do, that's going to result in a mistrial, and we're going to have to start all over again. Please don't do that. Don't talk about the case on Facebook or any other social network. Don't send a text message or an e-mail. Don't use Twitter. Don't discuss it in any way, shape or form electronically, again, until the case is over.

Next, don't let anyone talk to you about the case. If anyone approaches you and wants talk to you about the case, please report it to me immediately.

Next, during the trial, don't talk to any of the parties or the lawyers or the witnesses involved in the case. You should not even say hello. It's important that you give the appearance of doing justice, and if someone sees you talking to someone, even it's just being polite, even if you're waiting for the elevator, it might arose suspicion, so don't do

it. If one of the lawyers or the witnesses don't speak to you, they are obeying my instructions, too.

Next, please don't do any research on your own. Don't consult any reference materials, don't go to the place where the events supposedly took place, and please, please, please, please, please, please, please do not look up things on the Internet.

Again, this is a huge problem for the courts. If you think some piece of information is missing, you are not allowed to find that information out on your own. You must decide the case on the evidence that you've been given in this case. If you're curious about some things you can do it afterwards, but you cannot do it during the case.

Next, please don't read any news stories or articles about the case or listen to any radio or television reports about the case. I don't expect there will be any, but if there are, don't read them, don't listen to them, have someone put it aside if there's an article you want to read and you'll be able to read it after the trial is over.

Next, please be respectful to the Court. Please don't bring food or drink into the courtroom, and please try to dress appropriately.

Finally, during the course of the trial, if you have any kind of problem, please raise your hand, we'll stop the proceeding, and I'll try to take care of it.

Sometimes the lawyers get between you and the witness,

1.5

sometimes people mumble, if you can't hear a witness, sometimes you may need a glass of water, you need a Kleenex, you need a bathroom break, we will try to take one as best we can.

If we're not in court and you need to communicate with me, please give a signed note to the Court security officer to give to me. Those rules are important. Please follow them.

All right. I'm going to permit you to take notes in this case. The clerk will distribute a notebook. There will be a number on the cover of the notebook. That will be your juror seat number.

I want to give you a couple cautions about taking notes. Do not allow your note-taking to distract you from listening carefully to the testimony that's being presented. It's important that you observe and listen to the witnesses.

If you want to take no notes at all, a lot of notes, none at all, it's entirely up to you, but make sure you're listening to the witnesses. Please remember that not everything that you write down is necessarily what was said. When you return to the jury room to discuss the case, don't assume simply because something is in somebody's notes that it necessarily took place that way.

Notes are an aid to a recollection, nothing more. The fact that it's written down doesn't mean it's necessarily true. One of the things sometimes people do, they write down the question and not the answer. Again, the question standing

2.

alone is not the evidence, it's the question plus the answer.

You should take your notes with you to the jury room at every recess. You can't take your notes home or anyone else outside the courtroom or the jury room. At the end of every day, the clerk places them in the vault. They'll be returned to you the next day, and no one but you will ever look at them.

Now, as you can see, we have a reporter who's creating a record of everything that happens in this trial. Sometimes jurors think that they'll have a transcript of the trial when they go back to the jury room. That is not true. You will not be given a transcript. There are a number of reasons for that, but one of the reasons is strictly practical. Usually there's not enough time to prepare one. The Court reporter has a difficult job. It's time consuming to take a raw record, which is what she's creating, and turn it into a transcript, so you will not have a transcript, and you should, therefore, listen carefully to help you remember the testimony.

All right. Let me next talk about the outline of the trial. On January 5th, we will begin with the opening statements. The government will go first. It will tell in its opening about the evidence. It is not itself evidence. Its purpose is to help you understand the evidence. After the government opens, the defendant's attorney may, if he chooses, make an opening at that time. The government's evidence will come next. That will consist of the testimony of witnesses and

any exhibits that may be introduced. After the government's evidence, the defendant may present evidence, if he chooses.

Again, the defendant is not required to do so. He's presumed innocent. He does not have to testify and does not have to put on any evidence at all.

After you've heard all the evidence, the government and the defense will be given opportunity for final or closing argument. Again, like opening statements, they're a summary of the evidence but they are not themselves evidence. I'll then give you your instruction in writing about the rules of law that you're to use, and I'll read them aloud to you as well. After hearing everything together, you will go to deliberate to make your decision. You will never have to reveal your decisions or explain your verdict to anyone.

Now, as I've indicated, our normal trial day is from 9:00 in the morning to 1:00 in the afternoon, and you might wonder why we do it that way rather than go all day and get the case over with sooner.

One of the things we've found over the years, the cases don't really go much faster if we go all day. There are lots of reasons for that. One of them is that I have other work to do, sometimes on this case, and what often happens is that the jurors end up sitting and waiting, and that can be very frustrating. The cases start at 9:30 or 10:00, lunch tends to be two hours, and it's not any more a productive day

2.

than 9 to 1. It's also much easier on people who want to check in at their office or place of work, it's much easier on parents of school-age children, and lawyers and jurors get tired when we go all day, and the cases tend to drag in the afternoon. People don't pay as close attention.

To make sure this works properly, we have to be disciplined and keep you to a tight schedule. I want to begin trial every day 9:00 sharp. That means you need to be here before that to make sure we start on time.

I'm going to talk in a moment about what to do first thing Monday morning, but we'll start at 9:00 sharp. I will take two breaks, one at about 10:30, one at noon. They'll be about five minutes long, give you time to stretch your legs and go to the bathroom, that's it, and we'll go to one o'clock sharp.

Again, when the time comes for you to deliberate, you'll meet all day until you reach a decision. It might not take you that long, but you should plan for the possibility that you'll be here all day. I don't expect that to happen. I might ask for an afternoon session or ask to start a little early. I won't do that without checking with you, but if something goes wrong, I'll see if we can try a different schedule.

All right. Two other points before I get to my final instructions: The first is it's wintertime. We may have a

snow event, you never know. What we do basically is we follow what the Boston Public Schools do. If they are off for the day, we're off for the day; if they start an hour late, we start an hour late. So if you hear on the radio or see on the Internet that the Boston Public Schools are closed, we're closed that day, you don't have to come in, you don't have to call, and we'll sort it out.

The next is the unusual circumstance of the Tsarnaev trial starting the same day we're going to start. It's going to be crowded in the courthouse. We're bringing in more than a thousand people for that jury pool. You should probably thank your lucky stars that you're on a nice short trial instead of that one, but there are some logistics involved.

I've been asked to see if you can't get here by 8:30 in the morning because of logical reasons, including the elevators. It's going to be difficult to assemble everyone or more difficult than usual, but try to be here by 8:30, if you can.

There are going to be lines to get through the medical detectors, which you probably came in, but we also have one over on the side by the harbor, there's a little circular park, and it's likely to have much shorter lines, but try to allow more time to get through that, if you can, and we'll do the best we can. I ask that you be patient. I also ask that you don't wear anything of any kind that might be intended to

affect that trial. Please don't wear anything that says
"Boston Strong," for example, anything at all that could create
an issue in that case, just wear regular clothing. I'm sure
you have your own views and opinions about that case, but if I
could just ask you to wear conventional, no badges, no
T-shirts, no buttons and so forth, and your juror badge is a
badge. You probably don't want to wear it outside on the
street or outside the courthouse given, again, how crowded that
day will be. So I hope it all goes well, and if there's any
problem at all, we'll give you a telephone number to call in to
try to accommodate whatever issue you may have.

So I have a final instruction, and that is under our Constitution, all persons are equal before the law. Everyone accused of a crime, everyone is entitled to a fair trial. You should not hesitate to convict if you think the government has met its burden; you should not hesitate to acquit if you think it has not, but you should be completely and scrupulously open-minded, honest and fair. That is your duty as jurors, and that is your duty as citizens of the United States.

I thank you for your patience during the impanelment process. I hope you all have a good Christmas, if you celebrate, and New Year's, and I will see you in two weeks Monday, January 5th at 9:00 sharp beginning with the government's opening statement in this case. The clerk will show you to the jury room and give you contact information.

1 Thank you. All rise for the Court. THE CLERK: All rise. 2. (JURORS EXITED THE COURTROOM.) 3 4 THE COURT: All right. We have the dangling issue of 5 the possible redaction of the conviction records, which I'm 6 going to at least give some further thought to. Is there anything else we ought to take up while I have you here, 7 Mr. Wortmann? 8 9 MR. WORTMANN: I don't think so, your Honor. The only 10 thing you don't have yet, I'm waiting to get some Keeper of the 11 Records certifications from the Boston Police Department and 12 possibly one from the State Police, and as soon as I get those, 13 I'll give them to counsel, and I'll send maybe a revised once 14 we have all the redactions, I'll do revised books. 1.5 The only thing I'd ask, your Honor, if your Honor is 16 inclined to change the issue on the redactions, I'd really 17 appreciate it if we could have a conversation about that. 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 MR. WORTMANN: All right. 20 THE COURT: I should add, I'm not going to work on the 21 24th or 25th, I'm not sure about how it's going to play out 22 between Christmas and New Year's, but I'm reachable by e-mail, 23 and we can convene court, if necessary.

MR. WORTMANN: Part of it is just straight logistics

because I've done one set of redactions, and the other is, of

24

25

```
1
      course, on the merits as well.
               THE COURT: Yes, I understand. Mr. Garrity.
 2
               MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, we have no issues from the
 3
      defense side other than that one hanging issue, but I do have
 4
 5
      Court hearings scheduled throughout that week, but I should be
 6
      able to be available if the Court wishes me to make myself
 7
      available.
               THE COURT: And barring further developments, why
 8
 9
      don't we plan to meet at 8:30 Monday morning just to -- I want
10
      to do that every morning of the trial, if not earlier, to see
11
      if there's any issues we might want to take up. My advice,
12
      please allow enough time to get in, and, again, if you know
13
      anyone is going to be attending the trial or in the building,
14
      please again caution them about wearing "Boston Strong" or
15
      other type of clothing or badges or signs. All right.
                                                               Ιf
16
      there's nothing else, then have a good holiday, all.
17
               MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, I assume but American flags
18
      worn on the lapel?
19
               THE COURT: I would think not but everyone should
20
      exercise prudence.
21
               MR. WORTMANN: Sure, I just wanted to be careful.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you.
23
               (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
24
      12:45 p.m.)
25
```